

upon the work of the Senate, and I have no doubt that for being absent to-day he has a valid and legitimate excuse.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. May I ask the Senator further—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield further to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As the bill is before the Senate and the Senate is convened for the purpose of conducting public business, why should it not conduct it and go on? Why does the Senator appeal for the Senator from New Hampshire when he does not know whether he is absent on public or personal business?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey manifests a vast amount of solicitude now for the public business. Will the clerks at the desk please send me the letter that was read this morning, written to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses]?

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. It may be that the Senator from New Hampshire is away trying to adjust the differences between the campaign managers of Gen. Wood.

Mr. KING. The statement of the Senator from New Jersey perhaps is not intended as such, but it is an implication that he, the Senator from New Jersey, is always here and always ready to attend to public business, whereas the Senator from New Hampshire has been derelict in being absent from the Senate Chamber for a little while.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I will say to the Senator from Utah that if I am interested in a bill, or if I intend to object to a bill, I intend to be here and I always am here to look after it. I would under no circumstances delay the passage of any bill by my absence. I do not feel that I have a right to be absent from the Senate and hold up public business by my absence unless I am compelled to leave the Senate on public business. The Senator also is solicitous of the interests of the Senator from New Hampshire. I wonder why.

Mr. KING. It is very obvious, Mr. President, why I am solicitous, using the Senator's expression. Common decency, not to say common courtesy, would prompt any Senator to interpose to prevent the passage of a bill when another Senator is deeply and profoundly interested in it, and has given notice, if not publicly, at least privately, that he desires to speak upon it and to discuss it at length.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Assistant Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

|               |                |          |              |
|---------------|----------------|----------|--------------|
| Capper        | Jones, N. Mex. | Nelson   | Smoot        |
| Chamberlain   | Kendrick       | Norris   | Sterling     |
| Curtis        | Kenyon         | Nugent   | Sutherland   |
| Dillingham    | Keyes          | Overman  | Swanson      |
| France        | King           | Page     | Thomas       |
| Frelinghuysen | Lodge          | Philips  | Trammell     |
| Gronna        | McCormick      | Ransdell | Wadsworth    |
| Harris        | McCumber       | Sheppard | Walsh, Mass. |
| Harrison      | McKellar       | Simmons  | Warren       |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Assistant Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The names of the absent Senators were called, and Mr. GLASS answered to his name when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is still no quorum present.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

Mr. COLT, Mr. FALL, Mr. CALDER, Mr. BRANDEGEE, Mr. BALL, Mr. REED, Mr. BORAH, Mr. POMERNE, Mr. TOWNSEND, and Mr. WALSH of Montana entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

RECESS.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, May 8, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, May 7, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. J. W. Daily, Catholic Chaplain, Walter Reed Hospital, offered the following prayer:

O God of infinite wisdom, by whom all law is enacted and judgments decreed, we humbly beseech Thee to enlighten the minds of this Congress that their legislation may be for the spiritual and temporal welfare of our people, and that it may redound to Thy greater honor and glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### APPOINTMENT OF HOUSE MEMBERS TO POSTAL COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker is authorized by the Post Office appropriation bill to appoint five members of a joint commission created to investigate and report to Congress on the methods and systems of handling, transporting, and delivering the mails, and the facilities therefor. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON], is specified as one. The Chair appoints as the other four members on the part of the House the ranking members of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRIEST], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BELL].

### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 302. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Provincetown and Plymouth, Mass.

### EIGHTY-FOURTH BIRTHDAY OF HON. JOSEPH G. CANNON.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for opportunity to announce an important anniversary.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, our honored colleague whom I have in mind would be the very first to protest were I to halt the public business for any considerable length of time for the purpose of making a personal reference to him, for his long and honorable life has been peculiarly characterized by modesty, efficiency, and constant attention to the public business. Notwithstanding all this, Mr. Speaker, I can not resist the temptation to remind the Members that their colleague, "Uncle Joe" CANNON [long-continued applause, the Members rising]—

In view of this enthusiasm, Mr. Speaker, how could I possibly resist the temptation of reminding gentlemen that "Uncle Joe" is 84 years young to-day [loud applause], and on their behalf to wish him many further returns of the day [applause], and for a continuation of that mental alertness, that physical vigor, and that kindly philosophy with which he is this day so richly endowed. [Loud applause.] And I am just reminded that "Uncle Joe" will soon receive his twenty-fifth nomination for Congress. [Long-continued applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the following delightfully expressed telegram to "Uncle Joe" from one who has solved the problem of passing gracefully from an active life of splendid service into the serene calm of advanced age has just been handed me:

NEW YORK, May 7, 1920.

HON. JOSEPH G. CANNON,  
Washington, D. C.:

Cordial congratulations on your eighty-fourth. I beckon you on to the eighty-sixth milestone, which I am holding for you. It is a beautiful journey and glorious position.

CHAUNCEY M. DEFEW.

### DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask to take from the Speaker's table the conference report on the bill H. R. 11960, the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania calls up the conference report on the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARNER. Under the ruling of the Speaker, is it necessary to make a point of order now or would it be proper at the end of the reading of the report?

The SPEAKER. At the end of the reading of the report.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. GARNER. Now, Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARNER. If unanimous consent is given that the statement be read in lieu of the report, could a point of order then be made against the report?

The SPEAKER. Of course, the statement is in the nature of debate. The Chair will state that on that the point of order should be made now.

Mr. GARNER. It has been a little complicated as to when a point of order should be made.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I suggest that the gentleman ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to make the point of order after the statement has been read.

Mr. GARNER. I merely wanted to get the matter in the mind of the House. I have no objection to the reading of the statement in lieu of the report, but I ask unanimous consent that a point of order may be made at that time against the report instead of being made now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the statement.

The statement was read.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11960) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 10, and 13.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 14.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$480,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PURCHASE OF EMBASSY BUILDING AND GROUNDS AT SANTIAGO, CHILE.

"For the purchase of an embassy building and grounds at Santiago, Chile, and for making necessary minor repairs and alterations in the building to put it into proper condition, \$130,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Insert at the end of the proposed amendment a colon and the following: "Provided, however, That this is to be considered as the final appropriation under existing treaties for the maintenance of said commission, and the President is hereby requested to notify the Republic of Mexico that the United States desires to dissolve the commission from and after six months from July 1, 1920"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"FEES FOR PASSPORTS AND VISÉS.

"SECTION 1. From and after the 1st day of June, 1920, there shall be collected and paid into the Treasury of the United States quarterly a fee of \$1 for executing each application for a passport and \$9 for each passport issued to a citizen or person owing allegiance to or entitled to the protection of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to limit the right of the Secretary of State by regulation to authorize the retention by State officials of the fee of \$1 for executing an application for a passport: *And provided further*, That no fee shall be collected for passports issued to officers or employees of the United States proceeding abroad in the discharge of their official duties, or to members of their immediate families accompanying them, or to seamen, or to widows, chil-

dren, parents, brothers, and sisters of American soldiers, sailors, or marines buried abroad, whose journey is undertaken for the purpose and with the intent of visiting the graves of such soldiers, sailors, or marines, which facts shall be made a part of the application for the passport.

"SEC. 2. From and after the 1st day of June, 1920, there shall be collected and paid into the Treasury of the United States quarterly a fee of \$1 for executing each application of an alien for a visé and \$9 for each visé of the passport of an alien: *Provided*, That no fee shall be collected from any officer of any foreign Government, its armed forces, or of any State, district, or municipality thereof, traveling to or through the United States, or of any soldiers coming within the terms of public resolution approved October 19, 1918 (40 Stat. L., pt. 1, p. 1014).

"SEC. 3. The visé of a passport of an alien may, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State, be refused if the applicant would be dangerous to the public safety or obviously be liable to exclusion if allowed to present himself at a port of the United States for admission: *Provided*, That such applicant, if rejected by the officer of the United States to whom the application was originally made, may appeal to the Secretary of State: *And provided further*, That the issuance of a visé to an alien by a person duly authorized to issue such visé on behalf of the United States shall not relieve said alien or the steamship company transporting him from the operation of any provision of the laws of the United States.

"SEC. 4. From and after the 1st day of June, 1920, it shall be unlawful for any alien, other than a seaman, to enter or attempt to enter the United States without a passport duly viséd by a person duly authorized by the Secretary of State to issue such visé: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to nationals of Great Britain domiciled in the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, the Bermudas, or the Bahamas, or to nationals of France domiciled in St. Pierre and Miquelon, or to citizens of Cuba, Panama, or Mexico.

"SEC. 5. From and after the passage of this act every citizen or person, other than a seaman, owing allegiance to or entitled to the protection of the United States and departing from the United States or any of the possessions thereof for any foreign country, except the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, St. Pierre, and Miquelon, Panama, the Bermudas, the Bahamas, Mexico, and Cuba, or departing from the United States or any of the possessions thereof by way of any of said countries for any other country shall be required to bear a valid passport.

"SEC. 6. The validity of a passport or visé shall be limited to two years, unless the Secretary of State shall by regulation limit the validity of such passport or visé to a shorter period.

"SEC. 7. Whenever the appropriate officer within the United States of any foreign country refuses to visé a passport issued by the United States, the Department of State is hereby authorized upon request in writing and the return of the unused passport within six months from the date of issue to refund to the person to whom the passport was issued the fees which have been paid to Federal officials, and the money for that purpose is hereby appropriated and directed to be paid upon the order of the Secretary of State.

"SEC. 8. Section 1 of the act approved March 2, 1907, entitled 'An act in reference to the expatriation of citizens and their protection abroad' (34 Statutes at Large, pt. 1, p. 1228), authorizing the Secretary of State to issue passports to certain persons not citizens of the United States, is hereby repealed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

STEPHEN G. PORTER,  
JOHN JACOB ROGERS,  
H. D. FLOOD,  
*Managers on the part of the House.*  
H. C. LODGE,  
WM. E. BORAH,  
G. M. HITCHCOCK,  
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreement of the House to the amendments of the Senate on H. R. 11960, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921," submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference as to each of the said amendments:

The Senate recedes from its amendments Nos. 4, 10, and 13.

On amendment No. 4: Appropriating funds for emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service, increases the appropriation from \$400,000 to \$500,000.



On amendment No. 10: Providing for the expenses of the International High Commission, struck out the word "State" and inserted the words "the Treasury."

On amendment No. 13: Under post allowances to consular and diplomatic officers, added a proviso limiting the expenditure of the appropriation.

Senate amendments Nos. 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 14 were agreed to by the managers on the part of the House.

On amendment No. 5: Inserts a new paragraph appropriating \$4,500 for the relief of Mrs. Winifred T. Magelssen.

On amendment No. 7: Inserts a new paragraph appropriating \$9,000 for expenses in connection with the Pan Pacific Union.

On amendments Nos. 8 and 9: Changes the word "International" to "Inter-American."

On amendment No. 11: Changes the appropriation for the International Joint Commission on Waterways treaty, United States and Great Britain, from \$25,000 to \$40,000.

On amendment No. 12: Struck out the last proviso limiting the expenditure of the appropriation.

On amendment No. 14: Changes the appropriation for contingent expenses for the United States consulates from \$900,000 to \$1,000,000.

On amendment No. 1: Fixes the amount for clerks at embassies and legations at \$480,000 instead of \$688,000 as proposed by the Senate amendment.

On amendment No. 2: Increases the appropriation for contingent expenses, foreign missions, to \$900,000 instead of \$1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate amendment.

On amendment No. 3: Providing for the purchase of embassy building and grounds at Santiago, Chile; changes the language but leaves the appropriation of \$130,000 the same.

On amendment No. 6: Changes the language and makes this the final appropriation under existing treaties for the maintenance of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, and dissolves the commission from and after six months from July 1, 1920.

On amendment No. 15: Relating to fees for passports and visés, struck out the amendment submitted by the Senate and inserts new matter.

STEPHEN G. PORTER,  
JOHN JACOB ROGERS,  
H. D. FLOOD,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the conference report on the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, and especially that part that has to do with Senate amendment No. 6, on the ground that the conferees exceeded their authority by incorporating in the report matter which was not in disagreement between the two Houses. I desire to direct the attention of the Chair to that portion of the report which reads as follows:

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Insert at the end of the proposed amendment a colon and the following:

"Provided, however, That this is to be considered as the final appropriation under existing treaties for the maintenance of said commission, and the President is hereby requested to notify the Republic of Mexico that the United States desires to dissolve the commission from and after six months from July 1, 1920."

I desire to call the Speaker's attention to the fact that the House provision in the original bill reads as follows:

To enable the President to perform the obligations of the United States under the treaties of 1884, 1889, 1905, and 1906 between the United States and Mexico, \$5,000.

My contention is that that is simply an appropriating clause, that the House had authority to appropriate or not to appropriate, as it saw fit, and that under the rules of the House it could not legislate had a point of order been made. The Senate did not strike out the House provision. It left it intact, but added to it. In addition to the \$5,000 which the House appropriated, the Senate appropriated the unexpended balance for 1920, as follows:

The unexpended balance of the appropriation for the fiscal year ending July 1, 1920, is hereby made available for the fiscal year ending July 1, 1921, and for the objects and purposes designated by said act of appropriation.

And so the only question in disagreement between the two Houses is the language of the Senate just quoted, making available the unexpended balance of appropriations for 1920, because the Senate adopted the House provision as to \$5,000.

Now, the conferees neither struck out the House provision nor the Senate provision, but adopted both of the provisions, which amounted to an appropriation of \$5,000 and, in addition, the unexpended balance for 1920. But the conferees did not stop there. The conferees went further and added to the

Senate amendment a provision which is legislative in its character and which provides that, under the treaties between the United States and Mexico, this appropriation shall be the final appropriation, and requests the President to notify Mexico, in effect, that these treaties are to be terminated and abrogated. The clause is as follows:

Provided, however, That this is to be considered as the final appropriation under existing treaties for the maintenance of said commission, and the President is hereby requested to notify the Republic of Mexico that the United States desires to dissolve the commission from and after six months from July 1, 1920.

Both the House and the Senate proposals were confined simply to the function of making appropriations. Neither undertook to legislate or in any wise to change existing law as such law is defined in the existing treaties between the United States and Mexico.

Had either the House proviso or the Senate amendment in any wise undertaken to abrogate the treaties, the conference committee would have had the power to report an amendment germane to either of such provisions, but the proposition of legislation and the proposition of abrogating the treaties with Mexico are not germane to either the House or the Senate bill.

It will not be disputed that the general rule is that the members of a conference may not in their report include subjects not within the disagreements submitted to them by the two Houses. This rule has been well established by a long line of precedents. I beg to call the attention of the Speaker to Hinds' Precedents, volume 5, section 6410, where may be found a ruling by Mr. Speaker Reed. On May 2, 1898, the conference report on H. R. 5975, extending the homestead laws and providing for right of way of railroads in the District of Alaska, was before the House. A point of order was made against the report. It developed that among the Senate amendments was a provision relating to the fisheries question between Canada and the United States. The conferees added a provision for a commission to consider the differences between Canada and the United States in regard to trade relations. The Speaker ruled that the conferees transcended their authority because that matter was not one in dispute between the two Houses. In the same section may be found another decision by Mr. Speaker Reed to the same effect.

Hinds' Precedents, volume 5, section 6418, contains a ruling by Mr. Speaker CANNON to which I desire to direct the attention of the Speaker, and I desire to quote an excerpt from the decision in that case:

Under the act first referred to, of 1882, which is existing law, such detail is prohibited. In the Senate amendment there is no legislative provision repealing the act of 1882 or covering the detail of paymasters' clerks for duty in the Paymaster General's office, nor does anything of that kind appear in the House text which was stricken out by the Senate. It seems quite plain to the Chair that the subject matter of a repeal of the law of 1882 by an express provision or by implication, which contravenes the law of 1882, was not submitted to the conferees as a matter of difference between the House and the Senate. The Chair, therefore, will sustain the point of order as to that amendment.

It will be ascertained from a careful examination of the ruling just referred to that the disagreement of the two Houses on an Army appropriation bill was before the House, and a point of order was made that the conferees had exceeded their authority in including matters in the conference report not in disagreement between the two Houses. The matter agreed upon by the conferees included a provision changing existing law. Mr. Speaker CANNON ruled that there was nothing in the Senate amendment to the House bill containing a legislative provision repealing the then existing law, and that nothing of a legislative character repealing the existing law was contained in the House text which was stricken out by the Senate, and held that the subject matter of a repeal of existing law by an express provision or by implication was not submitted to the conferees as a matter of difference between the House and the Senate, and sustained the point of order.

So in the instant case the terms of the treaties between the United States and Mexico with reference to the International Boundary Commission constitute existing law. They are made so by the very terms of the Constitution and are binding upon the United States and its citizens. The House bill did not undertake to repeal such existing laws through the abrogation of the treaties; neither did the Senate bill. It is thus made to appear that the subject matter of legislation to terminate or abrogate the treaties was considered neither by the House nor by the Senate. Having been considered by neither House, this subject matter could not become the basis of a disagreement between the two Houses, and therefore is not a proper subject for the operation of the powers of the conference committee.

In section 6419, Hinds' Precedents, appears a ruling by Mr. Speaker Henderson which will be found somewhat in point. The House had passed a so-called omnibus claims bill. The Sen-

ate had struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted a new text in the nature of a new omnibus claim bill. The conferees had inserted in their report items for the payment of claims not found in either the House bill or Senate amendment. The Speaker sustained the point of order and held that these items could not be inserted on the theory that they were germane to the general subject matter of claims, but held that since they were contained in neither bill they were not within the scope of the disagreement of the two Houses, and the point of order should be sustained.

It should be clearly borne in mind, however, that in the present case the Senate did not strike out the language of the House bill and substitute entirely new matter in lieu thereof. Under circumstances of that character greater latitude and liberality are allowed. In the present case the Senate simply added language to the House bill. In that state of the record there remains nothing in disagreement between the two Houses except the Senate addition, which was of an appropriating character and in no wise undertook to abrogate a treaty.

Mr. Speaker CLARK, on August 17, 1912, second session, Sixty-second Congress, House Manual, section 942-a, sustained a point of order to a conference report on the naval appropriation bill on the ground that the conferees exceeded their authority by including in the report matters not in disagreement between the two Houses by the addition to a Senate amendment of the following words: "Of the Navy or Marine Corps," and also by the insertion of the words "with his consent."

On March 2, 1915, third session Sixty-third Congress, House Manual, 942-b, Mr. Speaker CLARK sustained a point of order to a conference committee report on the ship purchase bill, and in doing so said:

If there is anything settled about conferences between the two Houses it is this: Where two amounts are named and the question is referred to the conferees, they may oscillate as much as they please between the two extremes, but they can not go below the lower amount and they can not go above the higher amount. That applies to sums of money in appropriation bills. This has been ruled so often that it is as familiar as the multiplication table. In tariff bills, where the House suggests one rate on any given article and the other House suggests another rate, the conferees can not go below the lower and they can not go above the higher rate.

The RECORD discloses that the difference between the two Houses was as to the matter of time. The limit of time was fixed at two years and the conferees extended it to three years. The Speaker held that their limit was from zero to two years and that the conferees might agree upon any time between zero and two years but not upon a greater time.

So in this case the House bill contained an appropriation for \$5,000. The Senate amendment added to the \$5,000 the unexpended balance for the fiscal year 1920. These were the limits of the power of the conferees. They could neither agree upon a sum less than \$5,000 nor greater than \$5,000 plus the unexpended balance. All that was really in disagreement between the two Houses was the appropriation contained in the Senate amendment of the unexpended balance. The real matter in disagreement was thus restricted to the adoption of the additional appropriation of the unexpended balance, or an agreement upon a sum less than such unexpended balance.

The attention of the Chair is also directed to a ruling by Mr. Speaker CANNON, Hinds' Precedents, volume 5, section 6417. The headlines of this ruling read as follows:

The managers of a conference must confine themselves to the differences committed to them. Managers of a conference may not change the text to which both Houses have agreed.

At this point I also desire to quote the language of Mr. Speaker REED, cited in Hinds' Precedents, volume 5, section 6410. It was contended that the introduction by Senate amendment of a subject matter warranted the agreement by the conferees of any matter within the scope of such subject matter, even beyond the disagreement of the two Houses. Mr. Speaker REED answered that contention in the following language:

If we were to adopt the idea that when once the subject matter was introduced that was to control, and not the difference between the two bodies, we should be likely to enlarge the powers of the committee of conference rather beyond what was intended by the House. To the Chair it seems the point of order is well taken, and therefore the Chair sustains it.

It is respectfully submitted that the point of order should be sustained, both upon the ground that the report contains matter not considered by either House, and therefore not within the disagreement between the two Houses, and that it attaches legislation to an appropriation bill changing existing law, which is not germane to the Senate amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will.

Mr. PORTER. I can probably save the time of the House by conceding the point of order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well. If the gentleman concedes the point of order, I presume the Chair will not care to hear further argument.

The SPEAKER. Unless some gentleman wishes to be heard against the point of order the Chair will sustain the point of order. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendment to the bill H. R. 11960, the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, and ask for a further conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment to the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to; and the Speaker announced as the conferees on the part of the House Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. FLOOD.

#### SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13870, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] will please take the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13870, the sundry civil appropriation bill, with Mr. ANDERSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13870) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday we passed over the item in regard to the Board of Mediation and Conciliation on page 31, to be called up to-day. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] is present now, and inasmuch as he had as much, perhaps, if not more to do than any other man with the writing of the transportation act, I would like to have him make a statement with regard to this provision that is carried in the bill and the necessity for its continuation, if any.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] on a pro forma amendment to strike out the last word.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASEY. What is the parliamentary situation at present as regards the time and recognition to discuss the question?

The CHAIRMAN. We are now working under the five-minute rule.

Mr. CASEY. We are now proceeding under the five-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. And the gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; he will be.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I was not on the floor when the discussion was had yesterday on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CASEY] to strike out the provision in the sundry civil bill for the Board of Mediation and Conciliation. During the consideration of the transportation act in the committee, in subcommittee, and also in conference, this very matter was given very careful consideration. As a result of our deliberations we felt that it would not be wise at this time to put a provision in the transportation act repealing the act creating the Board of Mediation and Conciliation, due to the fact that there are some duties that that board could perform, notwithstanding the provisions in the transportation act creating the Railway Labor Board.

As to the necessity of continuing the Board of Mediation and Conciliation, permit me to read a portion of the testimony



presented before our committee by Mr. W. N. Doak, one of the legislative representatives of the brotherhood, and one who, perhaps, has given more study to the subject of labor disputes on railroads than any other man. In his testimony of July 25, last year, he stated:

I was asked the other day what I would suggest to be done with the Newlands Act and the Board of Mediation and Conciliation. I stated at that time that I would not interfere with it at all; that there might be cases, there might be times, and certain conditions under which the parties would desire to invoke mediation. If such is the case, I would let it continue. That law has adjusted more disputes, gentlemen, than any other piece of legislation that was ever passed on the face of the earth.

In the Railroad Administration I understand they have mediators that go out in certain cases and use their good offices to bring about adjustments of schedule revision cases, or to make new schedules with some of the railroads where the employees were not organized and had no agreement prior to the period of Government control, and I think it would be just as well to let the Board of Mediation and Conciliation, as provided in the Newlands Act, continue to function in cases of private ownership of railroads after this period of Government control ceases.

That was the statement made by Mr. Doak before our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the 25th day of July, and in the consideration of the bill in conference, weighing these words of Mr. Doak and also other testimony, and receiving a written communication from Mr. Chambers, who is at the head of the Board of Mediation and Conciliation, we concluded not to repeal that act but to specifically state in the transportation act that "the powers and duties of the Board of Mediation and Conciliation created by the act approved July 15, 1913, shall not extend to any dispute which may be received for hearing and decision by any adjustment board or the labor board.

It may be inferred from that language that nothing was left to the Board of Mediation and Conciliation. Let me remind you that the act creating the Board of Mediation and Conciliation is confined to common carriers engaged in interstate and foreign commerce, excepting therefrom street car companies. Now, listen to the first section of the labor title, namely, section 300, paragraph 1:

The term "carrier" includes any express company, sleeping car company, and any carrier by railroad, subject to the interstate-commerce act, except a street, interurban, or suburban electric railway not operating as a part of a general steam railroad system of transportation.

So that if you repeal the act creating the Board of Mediation and Conciliation, you leave no tribunal for the hearing of disputes arising on interurban or suburban electric railways not operating as a part of a steam railroad system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. ESCH. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ESCH. Some of the most intensive strikes in the United States occur upon the electric and interurban lines, and for that reason we felt that we would be justified in leaving that jurisdiction where it has been, under the Board of Mediation and Conciliation.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CASEY. Are the railroads just mentioned by the gentleman from Wisconsin engaged in interstate and foreign commerce?

Mr. ESCH. Very many of them are. Many of these interurban lines cross the State boundary lines. Many of them connect large commercial centers with the outlying country in another State. The gentleman has only to consider the case of Toledo, and of Detroit, and of Chicago, and of Kansas City, and of Omaha, and of many eastern cities. There are many electric lines that are interurban, and now if you repeal the act creating the Board of Mediation and Conciliation, you deny them any authority in law to appear before a board and adjust their disputes, because the transportation act specifically excludes them. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that there is sufficient for the board to do to justify its existence.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. ESCH. I do.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin what kind of a dispute may be considered by this Board of Mediation and Conciliation, inasmuch as section 316 of the transportation act provides that they shall not extend to any dispute which may be received for hearing and decision. It does not say "which has been," but "which may be received."

Mr. ESCH. It can not be received if the dispute arises on an interurban or suburban electric line. The act specifically excludes employees on such lines.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It does not say they might be received.

Mr. ESCH. No. For these reasons the conference committee on the transportation act framed the language as contained in section 316, and believed that there was enough work to do to justify the continuation of the Board of Mediation and Conciliation.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to intrude on the time of the House to any great extent in discussing this matter further. I said about all I cared to say on this subject yesterday afternoon. Judge Chambers called at my office about 11.30 this morning and left with me a memorandum, which I have read over hurriedly. I talked with him about the points that came out in the discussion in the consideration of this matter yesterday, and after discussing it with him for about 30 minutes I am more strongly impressed than I was yesterday that there is conflict between these two boards, and that there are bound to be conflicts from time to time.

Judge Chambers cited to me order No. 1 and decision No. 1 of the labor board about a case that would not be considered by the board until they had used all available means. I asked him to kindly cite to me the case he had in mind, and he said that they had offered their services to an organization in Buffalo, of which Mr. Heberling, of the switchmen, is president. I asked him what would be their position, what functions their board could exercise in that case. He said, "Our first move would be to try to get the men who left Mr. Heberling's organization back into it as a matter of conciliation." I asked him if he believed that was a proper function of a governmental board—to go out and tell men who left an organization to go back into it.

I also asked him why, if his statement was correct, the labor board is now considering the grievances of the railroad employees of the country directly without going to his Board of Mediation and Conciliation. Of course, there is no answer to that question. What happened? The bipartisan board provided for in the transportation act met. They could not come to an agreement, and the railroad executive refused to proceed further with the negotiations and took an appeal direct to the labor board, as provided for in the transportation act. They did not go to the Board of Mediation and Conciliation, which, we are told, they must go to before they have exhausted all available means, and I am satisfied in my own mind that there is a conflict between these two boards which is bound to cause trouble; and, as I stated yesterday, if this labor board is going to amount to anything, if it is going to be able to function properly, then all authority over these disputes should be centered in that board. Otherwise I am of the opinion that we are going to have trouble.

I asked Judge Chambers this further question: "Do I understand that your board takes the position that if their employees and the railroad executives, after negotiations for several days or weeks, finally arrive at the conclusion that they can not come to a settlement, and either or both sides then appeal directly to the labor board, that the labor board will refuse to accept jurisdiction and will say to those people, 'You have not exhausted all available means. You must go to the Board of Mediation and Conciliation?'" He left me under the impression that that was the interpretation that they placed upon the order and decision of the labor board.

I asked him further, if that were true, what authority this Board of Mediation and Conciliation had to handle the question of wages. Then he said that he could readily see where there would be use for the Board of Mediation and Conciliation in settling disputes after an award had been made, as to whether or not the wages as granted in that award were being paid and the award complied with.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CASEY. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. I wanted to know from him what authority they had to administer an award made by the labor board. I asked him if he did not think that the best tribunal to administer an award was the board that rendered the decision after hearing the testimony in the case.

So I say to you frankly, my friends, that, notwithstanding the conference I had with Judge Chambers this morning, I am still of the opinion that there is a useless duplication of work and conflict of authority that will breed discontent and

trouble on the railroads of the country; and in the face of the language of the transportation act, as I understand it, in the face of the facts as presented, and in the face of the statements made by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOON] as to the economy plan of this Congress, I am satisfied if you believe that this is a part of your economy plan to appropriate \$35,000 for a board that will do no good but just cause conflict and trouble in the country, you may do it if you wish, but you shall not do it with my vote.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Does the gentleman know of any instance where a Government commission or board having been created and then another one created to do the same work, the first one was abolished?

Mr. CASEY. I do not know of such a case, but I think it is about time we were doing just that thing.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That may be, but I just wondered if it was ever possible to abolish a useless office.

Mr. CASEY. I am trying to do it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words upon this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, this matter is very important, and I would be the last one to say a word in behalf of the Board of Mediation and Conciliation if I were convinced that there are no duties for such board to perform.

I called up the Board of Mediation and Conciliation, and I have here a statement which has been submitted by the board, which I would like to have go into the Record as a part of my remarks.

The documents herewith show the outline and to a considerable extent the details of the work of the board since its creation. Practically every railroad in the country and all employees connected with transportation have been directly involved in this work. Investigation will show the comprehensiveness, the speed, and the generally satisfactory way in which the work has been accomplished. The work has been peculiarly in the public interests, and during the six years or more of the life of the law and its administration there have been less than a half dozen strikes resulting in the cessation of train movement. The work of the board representing the public interests and accomplishing these results has no doubt incurred the hostility of certain interests at times.

There is no conflict between this law and this board and the recently enacted Esch-Cummins law and the board established under it. Section 301 of the "transportation act" provides:

It shall be the duty of all carriers and their officers, employees, and agents to exert every reasonable effort and adopt every available means to avoid any interruption to the operation of any carrier growing out of any dispute between the carrier and the employees or subordinate officials thereof.

It is clear from this language that the parties to a railroad labor controversy must be able to show to the Railroad Labor Board whenever a complaint reaches that board that they have directly exerted "every reasonable effort" and if those direct efforts have failed that they have adopted "every available means" to avoid any interruption, and so forth. The words "every reasonable effort" undoubtedly apply to the direct negotiations between employer and employees. The words "adopt every available means" include the employment of every and all agencies authorized by law to assist in these adjustments; and it is in this connection that the services of the Board of Mediation and Conciliation are most effective. The records of the board show that more than nine-tenths of the controversies which have been settled in the past have never gone beyond the mediation stage. Arbitration is only resorted to as a final expedient.

This statement is also in conformity with the view of the law as interpreted and announced by the United States Railroad Labor Board in Order No. 1 of that board, dated April 19, 1920, in the first clause of which it is stated:

As it is further contemplated and provided by the law that pending such conference, reference to and hearing by this board it shall be the duty of all carriers, their officers, their employees, and agents to exert every reasonable effort and adopt every available means to avoid any interruption to the operation of any carrier growing out of any such dispute; therefore this board will not receive, entertain, or consider any application or complaint from or by any party, parties, or their representatives who have not complied with or who are not complying with the provisions of the law or who are not exerting every reasonable effort and adopting every available means to avoid any interruption to the operation of any carrier growing out of any dispute between the carrier and employees.

Decision No. 1 of the United States Railroad Labor Board declining an application for hearing recites the following:

It does not show that the applicant had exerted every reasonable effort and adopted every available means to avoid any interruption to the operation of the carriers.

There is no reason to anticipate any conflict between the two boards, and there is every reason to anticipate that they will work in harmony, which has already been indicated in conferences between certain members of the respective boards, and it is recognized that the Railroad Labor Board, if applied to by the parties to the controversy, can take up the case which the mediation board has not been able to adjust through its assistance in direct negotiation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to insert in the Record as a part of his remarks the statement referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGEE. I took the matter up with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and he stated to me, as he has stated in the House, that in his opinion sufficient reason exists for the continuation of this board. I also called up the Railroad Labor Board and talked with Mr. Hanger, a member of that board, and asked him if he would give me a statement to present to the House of their views on the matter. He took it up with the board and afterwards stated to me that the position of the board is that, the matter not having been called to their attention before so that they could give it sufficient consideration, the board is reluctant to make any expression at all in the matter. He stated to me that the members of the board think that the House ought to get this information from the committees of Congress which had charge of the railroad bill.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] has given his views in the premises. So far as we are concerned the fact remains that the Congress created a Board of Mediation and Conciliation and the act has not been repealed.

Mr. NOLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE. I will.

Mr. NOLAN. Did Judge Chambers give you any idea of any considerable number of strikes or controversies settled between interurban lines or suburban lines?

Mr. MAGEE. I did not talk with Judge Chambers, but his communication refers to certain tables which I understand show a record of their work. The judge said in his statement that the records of the board show that more than nine-tenths of the controversies which have been settled in the past have never gone beyond the mediation stage, and that arbitration was the last resort.

Mr. NOLAN. The reason why I ask the question is that we have another board that deals with street railways, whether they are in the limits of the State or outside the State. That is the board connected with the Department of Labor.

Mr. MAGEE. I understand that. My point is that it seems to me that as far as the House is concerned we ought to proceed in a logical and orderly manner. Two great committees of Congress had under consideration railroad legislation, and the members of those committees ought to know more about the proposition than other Members who have not given it study, and I admit that I am not competent to speak on the proposition.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE. Certainly.

Mr. BEGG. Can the gentleman tell us why the railroad bill excluded the interurban lines; why the trouble on the interurban lines could not be settled the same as on the steam lines?

Mr. MAGEE. The gentleman had better put his question to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH].

Mr. ESCH. If the gentleman will yield, we eliminated the interurban lines all through the bill, because we did not want them subjected to some other provision, like extending it to the provision for securities issues.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman has hardly answered my question, other than to say that they were included on account of other provisions. Since they are eliminated, is it necessary to maintain two governmental agencies, at a big expense, to do the same piece of work?

Mr. ESCH. We knew that the Board of Mediation and Conciliation had jurisdiction.

Mr. BEGG. Could not the Labor Adjustment Board provided for in the steam-railroad bill settle the railroad problem on the interurban lines?

Mr. ESCH. If they were given the job, they would tackle it, I have no doubt; but they have enough to do as it is.

Mr. MAGEE. The members of the two committees of Congress having charge of railroad legislation in their wisdom have



seen fit not to repeal the act creating the Board of Mediation and Conciliation, but to continue it. Section 11 of the act creating the Board of Mediation and Conciliation provides that there shall be a Commissioner of Mediation and Conciliation, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, whose salary shall be \$7,500 per annum, who shall hold office for a term of seven years, and until a successor qualifies, and who shall be removable by the President only for misconduct in office.

Mr. CASEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. Does the gentleman mean to say that because of the act creating this position that Congress could not do away with this position when they provide another tribunal to do the work?

Mr. MAGEE. The gentleman certainly does not mean to intimate that he does not fully appreciate what his proposition means. I am giving facts. I have been seeking information, and I am giving that information to the House; that is all.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE. Yes.

Mr. BEE. Is this man Mahany, that we see so much about in the papers, a member of this board?

Mr. MAGEE. No; he is on an entirely different board. I understand there is a Board of Mediation and Conciliation in the Department of Labor that has jurisdiction of industrial disputes. But this board has jurisdiction only in railroad matters.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks for three minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGEE. The proposition is a complex one, and I am not competent to say, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce can say, whether it is wise to strike the proposed paragraphs from this bill. What I do say is that if you do, then your action amounts to this, that you starve a duly constituted body to death, one created by statute, one preserved and continued by the railroad act which you supported and voted for.

Mr. LAYTON. The gentleman's idea is that we should have three governmental functions for the settlement of labor disputes?

Mr. MAGEE. That is not my idea at all. My idea is that if we do not believe that there is sufficient cause for the existence of this board, then we should proceed in the usual and orderly way and repeal the act, which has been especially preserved in the railroad act.

Mr. LAYTON. If we do not sustain the motion to strike out of this bill that provision, then, in effect, we will have three governmental agencies for the settlement of disputes—one for the railroads, one for the trolley lines, and, I suppose, one for industrial matters in the Labor Department.

Mr. MAGEE. They settle different kinds of disputes, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch].

Mr. LAYTON. If that is a good idea, why not have a special conciliation board for the cotton workers and another for the woolen workers, and so on?

Mr. MAGEE. The gentleman is considering one phase of the proposition and I am considering another. What I say is that this is not the proper way, in my judgment, to get rid of the Board of Mediation and Conciliation, if we consider that there is no longer reason for its continuance. The proper way, if you are going to do it, is to repeal the act that created it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASEY) there were—ayes 35, noes 57.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania demands tellers. Those in favor of taking this vote by tellers will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Sixteen Members have risen, not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the second paragraph of the matter that was reverted to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Authority for incurring expenses, including subsistence, by boards of arbitration shall first be obtained from the Board of Mediation and Conciliation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The expenses of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, for administrative purposes, the payment of claims arising from the cancellation of contracts, damage charges and miscellaneous adjustments, maintenance and operation of vessels, and the completion of vessels now under construction, shall be paid from the following sources: (a) The amount on hand July 1, 1920; (b) the amount received during the fiscal year 1921 from the operation of ships; (c) not to exceed \$15,000,000 from deferred payments on ships sold prior to the approval of this act; (d) not to exceed \$25,000,000 from plant and material sold during the fiscal year 1921; and (e) not to exceed \$30,000,000 from ships sold during the fiscal year 1921: *Provided*, That, after the approval of this act, no contract shall be entered into or work undertaken for the construction of any additional vessels for the United States Shipping Board or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Strike out the paragraph and insert the following:

"For expenses of United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, for administrative purposes, the payment of claims arising from the cancellation of contracts, damage charges, and miscellaneous adjustments, maintenance and operation of vessels, and the completion of vessels now under consideration, \$197,500,000, which sum, together with the amount of the cash on hand on June 30, 1920, shall constitute the amounts which may be expended by the said corporation during the fiscal year 1921 for the purpose herein set forth: *Provided*, That all moneys received by the United States Shipping Board or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation during the fiscal year 1921 and thereafter, shall not be available for expenditure for any purpose whatsoever, and shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, let us have the point of order disposed of first.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think there is any portion of the amendment that is subject to the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. It is new legislation on an appropriation bill, unauthorized by law.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It simply means an appropriation for the expenses of the Shipping Board, which is authorized by law.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order. The only portion of the amendment that is subject to the point of order is the proviso, and if the amendment should be agreed to, I think the proviso ought to be agreed to also.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas made the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] made strenuous efforts before the committee to get this amendment in the bill. The committee saw fit to vote them down and not permit it to go into the bill. I do not know what change of heart has come over the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think the chairman is not in favor of this amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Not at all.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And even if I were to concede what the gentleman says, this is in the nature of an appeal from the committee to the House.

Mr. GOOD. I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows, if he is opposed to the amendment, that the proviso is subject to the point of order, and that because of that fact the whole amendment is subject to the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. But the gentleman from Tennessee could offer the amendment again without the proviso, and if the amendment should prevail certainly the proviso ought to prevail.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman believe that he has force enough to vote it down?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, I think so, unquestionably.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question, as a plain Member of the House who has to vote on this bill. I want the gentleman to state

to the House what will be the difference in dollars between the amendment of the gentleman and the bill as now printed.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I shall undertake to state that.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, can we not agree as to time for debate on the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think there are several gentlemen who want to discuss it one way or the other.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman realizes that we have read so far only 43 pages of the bill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think if the gentleman will let us proceed for a little while, we could then come to some agreement. I do not think there will be much discussion over here.

Mr. GOOD. Can we agree on 20 minutes of debate, 10 minutes on a side?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I would like to have 10 minutes myself, and that is all I shall ask. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN], a member of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EAGAN], a member of the committee, want to discuss it, and I understand the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BEE] desires five minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, we can not have two or three hours of debate upon this one amendment. There ought to be five minutes of debate for and five minutes of debate against.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think the matter is of a great deal more importance than the gentleman from Massachusetts seems to indicate.

Mr. GOOD. I realize the fact that the gentleman's amendment carries about \$197,000,000 and is of enough importance to take a little time in debate.

I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to 30 minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. But I would like to have 10 minutes—

Mr. GOOD. Say 40 minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think, in view of this amendment and the appropriation carried for the Shipping Board, involving about \$200,000,000, to undertake to limit debate upon what I conceive is a question of policy on the part of this House as to the manner in which appropriations shall be made for the Shipping Board is asking too much to limit debate merely to 30 minutes upon the amendment. I would like to have at least 10 minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman agree to 40 minutes?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I would like to have 10 minutes myself, and I propose to ask the House to give me that time, and here are several gentlemen who desire to get time.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman agree to 40 minutes—20 minutes to a side?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can not agree to that with these gentlemen here who desire to discuss the matter.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman will realize that we must get along. I have no desire to cut down—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Can the gentleman give 30 minutes to this side?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to one hour, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee and one-half by myself.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask that the time be made an hour and 10 minutes so that the gentleman from Tennessee may have 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to one hour, one-half of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa and one-half by the gentleman from Tennessee. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I approach the discussion of this amendment with some little degree of diffidence, in view of the statement made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] that it will unquestionably be voted down, for I presume he speaks with authority from his side. I have offered this amendment in the interest of what some of us believe to be a proper administrative policy with reference to appropriations made not only in behalf of the Shipping Board but in behalf of all other governmental activities. I am sure that all of us will concede that it is good administration and good business to make direct appropriations for governmental agencies where it can be done rather than to give those agencies an opportunity to reach into various reservoirs and receipts for the money necessary to carry them on during the fiscal year, and that is one of my principal objections to the provisions of this bill in reference to the Shipping Board.

Now, if the gentleman from Iowa is correct in his figures he set forth in the speech which he made under general debate

upon this bill, there is very little difference in the amount that is proposed to be appropriated by this amendment and the amount carried by the bill. For instance, the gentleman from Iowa makes available the unexpended balance upon July 1, which, according to him, will amount to \$61,000,000. He then makes available all receipts during the next fiscal year by way of operation, and, according to his statement, that will include something like \$70,000,000, which the Shipping Board states will be collected from the War Department on account of services heretofore rendered. It may amount to more, for it is claimed that the War Department owes the board over \$100,000,000. In addition to that, the provisions in the bill make available \$15,000,000, which they say they will collect during the next fiscal year on deferred payments on ships heretofore sold. In addition to that, it makes available not exceeding \$25,000,000, which the Shipping Board expects to derive through the sale of surplus material in plants, and so forth, in various parts of the country. In addition to that, the provisions in the bill make available \$30,000,000, or not exceeding that amount, from the sale of ships which will be made during the next fiscal year. The total amount as set forth by the gentleman from Iowa as carried in this bill under this kind of appropriation is \$200,000,000, and there may be added to that such net income as the Shipping Board may receive during the fiscal year from its operations. Now, they made \$8,000,000 during the first three months of this year. It is true, as Mr. Gillan states, that they may not realize that much during the next fiscal year; but if they have a net income at that rate during the next fiscal year they will derive from that source \$32,000,000. So if you concede that they will make something out of their operations during the next fiscal year, taking that with what is set forth by the gentleman from Iowa, then the provisions of this bill make available the sum of at least \$232,000,000, and a greater amount if the collections from the War Department should exceed \$70,000,000. Now, the amendment proposed seeks to appropriate directly the sum of \$197,500,000 and whatever balance they may have on July 1. I have offered this amendment, as I say, simply in the interest of what I believe to be good administration. I do not believe, gentlemen, that it makes for efficiency and economy, I do not believe that it makes for good conduct in office, to make indirect appropriations and permit a department or any other agency of the Government to reach into this reservoir and into that reservoir for the amount of money necessary to expend during the next fiscal year when Congress can determine what they should have. Certainly this Shipping Board has been in existence long enough to determine what it will need, and we ought to appropriate for it whatever money it needs and say to it that any receipts received during the fiscal year shall be covered into the Treasury as part of its miscellaneous receipts. In no other way can you keep a proper check upon governmental expenditures. As I understand, it has always been the policy of the Congress in all of its appropriations to make direct appropriations and let the Government and the people know just what amount of money is appropriated and what amount will be expended in order that, if a request is made for more money or when they come back to give an account of what money they have spent, the Congress may know what money they have had and know how to check them up. Now, there is another objection I have to the provision as offered by the gentleman. I am in favor of the sale of all these ships. I think we all agree upon that. I want to see these ships sold just as soon as it is possible to sell them, providing a fair and reasonable price is obtained for them and provided there is a guaranty that they will fly the American flag. The people of this country have spent about \$3,000,000,000 in building up a great and magnificent merchant marine. I do not want anybody to say that Congress has taken action which may result in depriving the people of the advantages of a merchant marine which the people of this country have desired for so long a time and which means so much in the development of our wealth and resources.

Now, what do you do? You do just what one gentleman who appeared before the committee said he wanted done. He said, "We want you to put us in a position to force the sale of these ships and force us to make the money with which to carry us on." I do not object, as I say, to selling the ships. On the contrary, I want to see these ships sold, but I do not want to put them in a position where they will be compelled to sacrifice those ships at a small value in order to derive the money necessary to carry them on during the next fiscal year. I would dislike very much to see the Shipping Board in a position where it would be compelled to sell ships at a less value than it ought to obtain for them in order to secure the necessary revenue and permit the board to say to the country if criticism results,



"We had to do it because Congress did not give us the money; we had to sell in order to get the money to carry on our operations and the various activities of the board." And that is one of the great objections I have to this form of appropriations. I believe we ought to appropriate directly what money they will need, and then say to them to proceed with the operation and the sales of these ships, and hold them responsible.

Now, it is unfortunate, exceedingly unfortunate, that this Congress has not established a shipping policy. Since the armistice was signed possibly \$1,600,000,000 has been spent or appropriated for this Shipping Board, if I mistake not. Congress has been in session for practically a year, and some shipping policy should have been heretofore adopted by Congress with reference to the sales of ships and with reference to what course shall be followed by the Shipping Board in the maintenance of those ships. But that has not been done, just as Congress has failed to act on many other needful reconstruction measures. There has been a bill introduced recently in the Senate, with the approval of the Senate Commerce Committee, which proposes to establish a policy for this Shipping Board. But until that is done, until Congress has established such a policy, it seems to me the wisest course and the most economical course, the most efficient course, is to appropriate whatever money is necessary for this Shipping Board to maintain itself during the next fiscal year. I understand that the bill introduced in the Senate provides for the sale of all these ships at the earliest practicable date. That proposition, I am sure, will meet with little if any opposition, but we by this method of appropriation are about to put the Shipping Board in a position where they will not have discretion to wait for a reasonable price or a practicable time in the event their money runs short. It is for these reasons that I have offered this amendment, and I hope it will be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman from Tennessee use some more time on that side?

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, we are trying here to appropriate \$200,000,000 to establish a policy for the Shipping Board. I raise the point of order that there is no quorum present. I think the Members ought to be here.

Mr. GOOD. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [The Chairman proceeded to count.]

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, if I may, I withdraw the point of order. I see gentlemen coming in.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE].

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee on the sundry civil bill gave pretty full hearings upon this proposition. Representatives of the Shipping Board appeared before the subcommittee and stated their views. After full consideration of the matter the committee acted as seemed best to them and in the public interest. We think that these ships ought to be sold by the Shipping Board as rapidly as sales in the public interest can be made, and I think that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] agrees with me in this contention.

We have provided in this bill what we consider reasonable amounts for the expenditures of the board. It seemed better to us to provide in the ways mentioned in the bill than to make a lump-sum appropriation. In other words, it will require a good many millions of dollars for the continuation of the work of this board for the coming fiscal year. We thought that it would be much better to have the Shipping Board active, especially as to sales of these ships, while there is a good market and before that market becomes depressed, than to make a large appropriation to be paid by the taxpayers of the country.

The plan provided in this bill is along the line of economy adopted by the House. We believe that in every possible way we should economize in public expenditures and should impress this view of economy in every way that we can upon every board and upon every department of the Government. And, so far as I am personally concerned, in the matter of taxation I think that if we are to do anything, we should revise taxation downward and not upward.

If we can encourage the board to adopt the policy of selling these ships upon the present market, we think that is the best way to subserve the public interest, and it has been that policy of economy that has controlled the judgment of the committee in making the provisions that are contained in this bill.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAGEE. Yes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Does not the gentleman think they ought to be limited in the sale of these vessels to obtaining an amount that would at least be equal to what it would require to replace the vessels? And if under the conditions of this bill you have forced a sale which is an emergency sale, and they should sacrifice the ships in order to continue their operations, would not Congress be much to blame for it?

Mr. MAGEE. Well, I do not agree with the gentleman, because we have not only in this country, but in Great Britain, I would suggest to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, a standard of cost of production which is constantly varying. We can not expect to sell our ships above the standard of cost of production.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I desire that the gentleman have a minute more in order to answer a question.

Mr. GOOD. I yield another minute to the gentleman.

Mr. JUUL. The committee's report here shows that you are reducing by \$100,000,000 the authorization for construction of ships. Could the gentleman tell me what proportion of this amount of money is now expended and what proportion is still to be expended for construction?

Mr. MAGEE. The question as to that particular item should be addressed to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JUUL. The committee report shows that you are reducing the appropriation by \$100,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. Those are contract authorizations, where the contracts have not been let for new ships.

Mr. JUUL. What proportion of this amount is yet to be expended?

Mr. GOOD. All of that will not be expended. It has been cut out. We have passed on that.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I am very sorry that my distinguished colleague [Mr. MAGEE], who is my associate on the subcommittee on this sundry civil bill, evidently does not quite grasp the full meaning of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]. That amendment takes no money out of the Treasury of the United States, and there is no question of economy involved, as the remarks of my friend who has just spoken would indicate. We are dealing solely with a question of policy, and I fear that the House does not as yet understand this to be a fact.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, the Emergency Fleet Corporation will need at least the amount specified in the Byrns amendment in order to complete the construction program, to adjust cancellation claims and other claims, for all other administrative purposes, and to recondition the former owned German liners, if the Shipping Board decides to change its present attitude with reference to this class of ships. I am one of those who never were and who are not yet satisfied with the manner in which the expenses of that board are provided for in the language of the bill before us. I prefer the amendment offered by my colleague, and if the House would give it nonpartisan consideration, I have not the slightest doubt but that it would be adopted overwhelmingly.

I regret that debate on this amendment has been limited, because there are many things that could be said for the proposed change in the bill which must remain unsaid. While I am on my feet, however, I want to go on record as one of those who are not in agreement with what some of the previous speakers have alleged to be the prevalent sentiment in this House, and that is that all these ships, including the German liners, should be sold now.

I do not believe in a forced sale, and I fear that we are up against that very thing if we proceed to put these German liners on the market. I know that the Shipping Board has not asked Congress to give it any money for reconditioning these ships, but the Byrns amendment provides a very substantial amount for this very purpose, and that is one reason why I advocate its adoption. These ships ought to be reconditioned before they are put on the market, so that they shall not be sold at a sacrifice.

Let us not forget, my colleagues, that these ships were considered the best of their kind in the world before the war. They were taken from an enemy. We spent millions of dollars on them, and they carried hundreds of thousands of our boys over to France and then brought them back from the battle fields of Europe in safety. These ships contributed in no mean degree in saving modern civilization from the militarism of the Kaiser. Naturally these facts have had much to do with creating a pronounced sentiment among the American people against the sale of the ships to any foreign corporation.

If the Government continues to own and operate these ships, I feel confident that we will help to develop a genuine service,

and we will soon have it on a paying basis. Then the ships can be disposed of at least for all they have cost us, if not more, under such restrictions and upon such terms as will not only insure the maintenance of the service, but their continuance under our flag.

I am one of those who believe that we should make a renewed effort to develop our trade and extend our commerce. England has already started to do everything possible to aid her business interests and to maintain her former trade. America can and ought to have a large portion of the world's trade in the hands of her people if she will only make a determined effort to get it. This is not the time to hamper the Shipping Board, which, although it may have made mistakes, is now trying to recover from those mistakes and to do its level best to develop the trade of this Republic. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts yields back two minutes. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Tennessee use some more of his time?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. How many more speeches have you on that side?

Mr. GOOD. Two or three.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Let us have one of them.

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I can readily understand the hesitation of the gentlemen on the other side. There is no argument to be made on the amendment. The gentlemen are therefore reluctant to appear in support of it. I am not surprised at that. There is still virtue on that side of the House. [Laughter.] Perhaps not so much, but some.

Mr. GALLIVAN. It has absolutely disappeared on the other side. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. There are two fundamental and conclusive objections to this amendment. First, it places in the hands of the Shipping Board about \$100,000,000 more than it ought to have. That is the first objection—\$100,000,000 more than it needs. Many of the Members on the Democratic side have heretofore patriotically supported us; the majority of them have supported us in our plan and purpose of economy. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] in the main has, but he has suddenly broken out in extravagances at this late hour in the session and wants to give the Shipping Board \$100,000,000 more than it needs and more than it ought to have.

That is the first objection. The second objection to the amendment is that instead of putting the Shipping Board on its metal, instead of compelling the Shipping Board to collect the sums due it, instead of compelling the Shipping Board to do business in a businesslike way in order to get the money needed for its operations, it is proposed to go down into the pockets of the American people for a couple of hundred millions of dollars and leave the Shipping Board without incentive to either collect the sums due it or to make the ordinary efforts that should be made in the course of business and secure in that way sums needed for expenditure.

Now, either of those objections is conclusive. First, the appropriation is excessive in the sum of about \$100,000,000. It may not seem so much to some gentlemen, but we are finally waking up to a realization of the fact that \$100,000,000 is a sum worthy of consideration.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This bill as reported by the committee, and for which the gentleman stands, carried a possibility of \$232,000,000 in itself. Does the gentleman propose to offer an amendment to cut that down?

Mr. MONDELL. The amendment offered by the gentleman would carry with it the possibility of an expenditure of more than \$325,000,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. MONDELL. There is no question about that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is a question of mathematics.

Mr. MONDELL. I am entirely right; if I had the time I could give the details. The chairman of the committee will give the gentleman the details. I am sure he will do that. I could do it if I had the time.

It is \$100,000,000 more than is necessary. Then it takes it all out of the pockets of the American people and leaves the Shipping Board free to pursue the even tenor of its way, without collecting the sums due it from the Army, without collect-

ing the sums due it from other sources, without making any sales or transfers, safe, secure, serene, floating on the boundless sea of Federal munificence, dragging hundreds of millions of dollars out of the pockets of the people, instead of doing business and getting its money in a businesslike way. Now, just why in a momentary lapse of virtue the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] should take this peculiar shift of view I do not understand; but I am satisfied that no gentleman on either side who understands the facts in the case will vote for the amendment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], in saying that we had a little virtue left on this side of the House, said a great deal more than could be said for his side of the House this morning. [Laughter.] The truth is that among his virtues to-day the virtue of accuracy can not be included. In fact I believe if he were pressed to tell the truth, he would state that he was not in the House when the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] was read and that he had not read the provision in the bill. He proved the correctness of my statement when he said to the House that the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] involved an expenditure of \$332,000,000.

Mr. MONDELL. No; I said \$325,000,000, but I stand corrected. I think it probably would involve that.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will take it at \$325,000,000. The amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] provides a specific appropriation of \$197,000,000 and the balance on hand, and if the gentleman from Wyoming says there will be a balance on hand of \$150,000,000, I challenge him to point out any testimony in justification of his statement.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman claim there is anything in the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee that would prevent them from collecting the sums due from the Army and using those sums?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. There is absolutely nothing in the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee that would justify the expenditure of more than \$197,000,000 and the balance on hand, which amounts to \$55,000,000. Then turn to the statement of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] made in the general debate, and you will find on page 6416 of the Record that he stated that this bill as it now stands carries \$200,000,000. Then where is the economy? Certainly there can be no economy except as to the difference between the amount that is carried in this bill of \$200,000,000 and the amount that the balance on hand causes the total under the amendment to exceed \$200,000,000.

But here is the position that we take: It is the position that has always been taken by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] as long as he was a member of the Committee on Appropriations. He never before contended that it was wise legislation to establish revolving funds in Government departments and authorize them to spend money as it was turned in. Why, at the beginning of this session of Congress you brought into the House a proposition to take away from the Housing Corporation this very power, because we knew it was a dangerous power to leave in the hands of any department.

You caused the Housing Corporation to turn its revenues into the Treasury and secure its money by direct appropriations from the Congress, in order that we may keep our finger upon the appropriations and determine how the money is being spent. It was good business for you to do that. Then your Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries came in, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE], chairman of that committee, reported a bill which passed this House, and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] voted for it, requiring the Shipping Board to do exactly what we say now that they ought to do, to turn into the Treasury of the United States the proceeds from the sale of ships and from every other activity, and then appropriate to them the money that they need to pay their obligations.

Now you are reversing your position, and the position which the Merchant Marine Committee and this House said was right, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROWE] and every other man who served on that committee. You say now they were wrong, and you authorize the Shipping Board to use its revenues to pay its obligations, so that the Congress of the United States can never tell how much they have spent or what has become of the money, and you call that good business. No excuse is offered us for this sudden change of front and this presentation to us of an unbusinesslike system never before considered. What is the effect of it? There is no economy in it. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] says this bill appro-



prises \$200,000,000. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] asks for a direct appropriation of \$197,000,000. Where is there any economy in the proposition of the gentleman from Iowa? The only difference is one of policy. The bills and obligations of the Shipping Board under the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] will be paid out of the direct appropriation, and all the money received from any source will be turned into the Treasury. Under the proposition contained in the bill they are foot-loose to secure money from any source and invest it in anything that they need. The source from which it is expected that they will receive it is the sale of ships, and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and every other gentleman on this floor knows that if the Shipping Board can sell its ships in the open market at such time as best prices can be obtained, they can receive a greater amount of money for them than they can if they are forced to sell at any time when their obligations become due. Those who seek to buy these ships know the situation. They know that if a ship is to be launched from some plant in this country and the Shipping Board has to pay for the ship and has not the funds, they have got to sell some ships in order to get them, and bidders will make lower bids than they would under other circumstances. If you adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] and the bids are too low, the Shipping Board will reject those bids, but if you do not adopt this amendment and follow the provisions of the bill, they can not reject the bids which are made. They must accept them no matter how low they are in order to meet their obligations. Is that good business? [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the statement has been made by gentlemen supporting the amendment that the original bill provides for a revolving fund, and I think the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNS], to whom I am always delighted to listen, made most of his speech on that idea. I do not think that is correct. The item in the bill provides for the expenditure of certain moneys if they are received by the Shipping Board, but it does not provide what is called a revolving fund at all, and it authorizes the expenditure of, I think, at least \$50,000,000 less than the amendment.

Now, to say that we on our side are going back on the theory of the House in reference to indefinite appropriations out of the revolving fund is an assertion that I can not let go unchallenged. I have sat here for years and opposed as a general thing, not always, expenditures of money on the revolving-fund plan. But here is an actual limitation in the bill. In one case \$15,000,000 is authorized, in another case \$25,000,000 is authorized, in another case \$30,000,000 is authorized, but only if the money is received. The gentleman from South Carolina said they could spend the money for any purpose they pleased. They can spend it for no purpose under the language of the bill that they could not spend it for under the language of the amendment. In that respect there is no difference.

The amendment proposes an expenditure and invites an expenditure of \$197,000,000, plus the balance on hand, which, I am told, amounts to in the neighborhood of \$60,000,000. The original provision authorized the expenditure of \$70,000,000, plus the amount that is on hand and the amount that may be received from the operation of the ships. I do not know how much may be received from the operation of the ships, but if we can judge of the future by the past it will not be a very considerable sum of money.

The amount of money which has been expended by the Shipping Board on capital investment and the amount received from operation would make an interest profit so small that it would be almost infinitesimal. The Shipping Board has been regarded as the most extravagant in some respects of all the commissions that we have created. More unseaworthy ships have been constructed by the Shipping Board, probably, than by all other concerns in the world for years past.

Now, I am not disposed myself to criticize any of the operations of these war activities. I can understand that in the desire of this country to prepare for and win the war it undertook many things which did not turn out profitably. But it was desirable, and they proceeded to do something. So I am not disposed to criticize what they have done. I can see no excuse for Congress to authorize under the amendment proposed at least \$50,000,000 more to be wasted by this board than would otherwise be permitted to be used by them. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, there is a large amount of difference of opinion on this amendment that does not grow out of any question about economy. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee will not add to the expenses of the Shipping Board. The trouble with the bill in the shape that it is is that it provides a revolving fund to be constituted of the total assets and income that from any source comes into the hands of the Shipping Board, which may be expended without any limitation, except only that it must be derived from the sources named.

The amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee follows a policy that has been pursued by this Government always requiring its functionaries to spend a certain legally appropriated sum and account for it, and that any sums coming in from its activities to be covered into the Treasury of the United States. That is the practice of the Post Office. This bill, as it now stands, forces the Shipping Board to go to its own sources of income alone in order to pay its current expenses; it places the Shipping Board in a condition where it must make sales in the emergency market. A great portion of the funds to run the Shipping Board and meet certain obligations must come from the sale of ships, and a certain element in this country, if ship sales are forced, would be able to press down the price of ships and make such sales slaughter sales.

When a ship is sold only a very small per cent is paid. Under the bill as written the board is authorized to raise \$30,000,000 from the sale of ships. And to meet all the payments they must make under this very law they may be forced to sell. The proposition has been to sell the ships on a 10 per cent cash payment, and to raise \$30,000,000 would require a sale of \$300,000,000 worth of ships. Certain great interests might place the Shipping Board in a situation where it would feel constrained to sell at a sacrifice the ships of our country, and the Government would suffer. The amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee relieves the Government from the possibility of having its ships sacrificed in slaughter sales in order to raise funds to pay the essential current expenses of the Shipping Board. [Applause.]

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I have not the time; I have but five minutes. If the gentleman will give me two minutes more, I would be glad to answer. Why, gentlemen, there will be \$125,000,000 to pay to the contractors for cancellation of contracts. There will be \$84,000,000 to pay for the completion of ships under contracts that we have already made and are bound by. As this goes along the Government of the United States ought to have the money in hand to pay its indebtedness and not feel that they are required to sell ships to do it or to sell other property owned by the Shipping Board at a sacrifice or else default in payment.

This bill may require the Shipping Board, in order to obtain funds to meet obligations as it goes along, to sacrifice the property of the United States for a song. It violates every principle we have ever thought was essential to economy in administration by giving a carte blanche to the Shipping Board. You say to them, "Do as you please; sell the ships; sell this property; get the money"; and then it is unlimited in another respect. They are authorized to apply all of the earnings after it comes into their hands from the operation. Under the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] if an excess or a profit is made from the operations it will go into the Treasury; in fact, all it makes, whether it be much or little, will be covered into the Treasury, and I am hoping that under an administration such as has been installed since the time that John Barton Payne came into charge of the Shipping Board and which has continued under Admiral Benson this merchant marine of ours, owned by the Government, will make big profits during the fiscal year 1921. If they should do so, they are authorized to squander it all under the bill as it is written. I think economy requires that we should adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The real "nigger in the woodpile," in my belief, is that by the terms used in the bill the Republicans seem to make no appropriations for the Shipping Board and have boasted that they reduced the estimate for expenditures of the Shipping Board. You mark what I say. When they come to tell the country what amounts they appropriated they will have no item for the Shipping Board. It is a cheap way of trying to fool the people.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple proposition. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] undertook to say that it meant an expenditure of an additional \$100,000,000. I am quite sure that the gentleman from Wyoming has not read the amendment or heard it read, nor has the gentleman read the provision in this bill. It will

not add an additional sum to the amount carried in this bill, as has already been clearly demonstrated.

Mr. MONDELL. "The gentleman from Wyoming" has read the amendment carefully.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then I am very much surprised that the gentleman made such a statement on the floor of this House, because he is entirely mistaken.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Perhaps the gentleman from Wyoming read the amendment after he made the statement.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], as appears from the Record, made the statement that, according to the provisions of the bill, it carries \$200,000,000 for the Shipping Board, and that that did not take into consideration any possible receipts from operations for the next year or any additional amount that may be collected from the War Department. This amendment carries \$197,500,000 as a direct appropriation, plus whatever balance may be on hand, and it was stated in the hearings that the balance would possibly be \$55,000,000 on July 1; but I was told by Mr. Dean yesterday that their figures were probably too high, and he doubted that they would have more than twenty-five or thirty million dollars on July 1. What do they need? They need \$84,000,000 to complete construction of 400 ships on the ways and nearly all of them will be completed in October; they need \$24,000,000, so they say, for administration. Then, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] says, there are \$250,000,000 of claims on file now growing out of the cancellation of contracts, and they figure that they will be settled for \$125,000,000. Those claims ought to be settled during the next fiscal year. In addition to that, they ask the committee for \$44,000,000, the amount necessary to complete the reconditioning of the German ships taken over during the war. This amendment, if they have a balance of \$55,000,000, will provide \$252,000,000 for the Shipping Board for the next fiscal year. I call the attention of the gentleman from Wyoming to one fact that he forgot, if he read the amendment prior to his speech, and that is that this amendment covers every dollar of the receipts of the Shipping Board during the next fiscal year into the Treasury, and that is good business. That is proper administration. That is the kind of legislation this Congress has adopted always in matters of this kind in the past. That is something this bill does not do. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, it is true that the House bill makes provisions whereby \$200,000,000 will be available for the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation, assuming that they will make the sales which the Shipping Board themselves have said can safely be relied upon without sacrifice. Complaint is made with regard to the statement of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], and in all fairness I want to call the attention of the House to the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee. The Shipping Board stated they had on hand, or would have on hand July 1, in cash, approximately \$61,000,000. They further said that the Army owed the Shipping Board something around \$120,000,000 or \$130,000,000 for services already rendered, and that they expected to receive approximately \$70,000,000 from that source.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think the gentleman is mistaken about the amount on hand. It is \$55,596,000.

Mr. GOOD. It is \$61,000,000, assuming that they do not expend anything in the meantime on the reconditioning of the German ships.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. But they said they were going to spend that.

Mr. GOOD. They should not, and I trust they will not. It was admitted that the War Department, or the Army, owed the Shipping Board a large amount of money, and they have agreed on \$70,000,000. Suppose that is paid before the 1st day of July, and they have the money to do that, what would be available under the gentleman's amendment? Not \$61,000,000, not \$55,000,000, but just as the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] stated, there would be of cash on hand \$131,000,000 that would be available for this purpose, because the gentleman seeks to appropriate by this amendment \$197,500,000, and then provides—

which sum, together with the amount on hand on June 30, 1920, shall be available—

And so forth.

Now, if the Army pays the \$70,000,000, they will have \$131,000,000 of cash on hand, which, added to the \$197,500,000 provided for in the amendment, would give them \$338,000,000 available, as against an estimate—the wildest estimate of the Shipping Board—of \$306,000,000. If any complaint can be

made because this Congress has not done the right thing with the Shipping Board, it is because we have appropriated too much money.

The House was right in its bill of last year, and when it went to the Senate we were obliged to add \$60,000,000 more, and now the Shipping Board comes and says that they have \$61,000,000 more than they will expend. What did the gentleman who represented the Shipping Board say regarding this item? We do not act without advice. Mr. Gillen, the special representative of the chairman, the man who came before the Committee on Appropriations, explaining this item, said:

This being a liquidating job, we should be told that there were not any appropriations for us, and that we should see to it that out of our liquidations we get enough money to do the job.

We have taken the Shipping Board at its word. We have given them, with some limitations, just what they said they would get in liquidations, without selling a single house or a single ship at a sacrifice. If you had a house to sell, when would you offer it for sale? Now, when prices are high and material is high, and there is a scarcity of houses, or would you hold it for two or three years, when labor will come down and material will come down, and when, perhaps, there may be an overflow of houses, and sell it then? It was the opinion of the officers representing the Shipping Board that these assets that the Government had to sell and that the Congress said they should sell should be sold when there was a market for them, and not wait until the market was passed.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Does not the gentleman know that the Shipping Board has received bids for a very small percentage of their ships?

Mr. GOOD. I know that they have some ships they never will get any bids for. I know that they have a lot of wooden ships that they do not know what to do with, and nobody wants them, and we never should have possessed them.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman state to the House whether or not there has been a tremendous pressure by the Shipping Board to have the Byrns amendment adopted?

Mr. GOOD. No; I think not. We have done in the bill just what the representative of the chairman of the Shipping Board asked for—that is to say that this is a liquidating proposition, except that we said that they should not expend to exceed these specified amounts, which are practically all that the Shipping Board asked for.

I submit if there has been a department of Government during the war that has been run without applying business principles, has been run along in the most wasteful, extravagant way, that concern is the Shipping Board and Emergency Fleet Corporation. They do not know to-day where they stand; they do not know anything about their authorizations; they do not know how much cash they have; they do not know how much is owing them; they do not know about their earnings; yet the gentleman from Tennessee, out of an empty Treasury and from the pockets of the taxpayers of the country, would take \$197,500,000 and turn it over to this board! We say to the board, "Execute the law, sell these ships while there is a demand for them; do not sacrifice the ships, but sell them for what they are reasonably worth." Why, out of the total amount required they only estimate they will receive for ships sold \$25,000,000 during the next year, so there can not be very much sacrifice when they only propose to receive \$25,000,000 by the sale of ships next year. Now, what is the committee trying to do? The committee has recognized the fact that this organization—and not a member of the organization itself but what will say they do not know very much about the business; it has run away from them; they are lost in the mazes of the work of the Shipping Board; they know little about it—we simply say to them, "You will have to cut your goods according to the cloth. You will have to go out and do the things that Congress has asked you to do."

Now, I know there is pressure being brought to bear by certain shipping interests that do not want these ships sold at all. They want to continue building more ships for shipowners, and they do not want the Government to interfere with the market. [Applause.] I am looking not after their interests but after the Treasury of the United States in this matter, and I believe that the provisions we carry in the bill are along the lines that a business man would adopt if he were spending his own money. Now, gentlemen, there may be some advantage in raising this bill from \$428,000,000 to over \$600,000,000, as is proposed by this amendment, and taking the \$197,000,000 out of



the pockets of the taxpayers of the American people rather than to require—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman does not want to make a statement that might possibly mislead—

Mr. GOOD. No; not at all.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman does not contend that the money he authorizes to be used here will not go into the Treasury under this amendment. He is simply—

Mr. GOOD. I do not yield further. I say it is an inefficient board, that has done its work very poorly, and nobody knows it better than the gentleman from Tennessee, and he is with me in that—there is no difference of opinion between us on that—and I think their duties first should be to adopt a business policy, to get the money out of the things they own and that Congress has said to them they should sell, and not go to the taxpayers and get the money out of their pockets. For reasons I have expressed and for the further reason that this Congress should exercise the strictest economy in the appropriation of money, that we should not add to this bill \$197,500,000 for any such purpose as the gentleman has expressed, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the Shipping Board said they would not collect the War Department claims until next year; and in view of the statement of the gentleman from Iowa I wish to ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment so as to meet this particular objection and add, after the word "that," in line 7 of the amendment, the words "not exceeding \$55,000,000 of."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I object to any modification of the amendment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then I shall reoffer it.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, then I raise the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And the gentleman has to keep a quorum the balance of the day.

Mr. GALLIVAN. And you will have to keep a quorum here the rest of the day and all the rest of the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment in the manner indicated and the gentleman from Massachusetts objects, and the gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman should object to the minority side confessing that their amendment has no virtue and needs to be modified.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] gets excited.

Mr. GALLIVAN. No; not in the slightest; that never happens to the gentleman from Massachusetts when the gentleman from Illinois is present.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. GOOD. I hope the gentleman will withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request for a modification.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee) there were—ayes 35, yeas 71.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment, the same amendment with the words "not exceeding \$55,000,000 of" inserted after the word "that."

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the paragraph and insert the following:  
"For expenses of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation for administrative purposes, the payment of claims arising from the cancellation of contracts, damage charges and miscellaneous adjustments, maintenance and operation of vessels, and the completion of vessels now under construction, \$197,500,000, which sum, together with not exceeding \$55,000,000 of the amount of cash on hand on June 30, 1920, shall constitute the amounts which may be expended by the said corporation during the fiscal year 1921 for the purposes hereinbefore set forth: *Provided*, That all moneys received by the United States Shipping Board or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation during the fiscal year 1921 and thereafter shall not be available for expenditure for any purpose whatsoever and shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss the amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, debate is closed.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Debate was closed on the other amendment, and I appeal to the Record.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman we were very fair, and the request was on the paragraph and all amendments thereto.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. LAYTON. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GOOD. I hope the gentleman will let the gentleman from Tennessee proceed.

Mr. LAYTON. I withdraw the objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment simply to meet the objections that were raised by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD]. I made the statement in the discussion of the preceding amendment that if that amendment was adopted it would not allow exceeding \$252,000,000, in round numbers, for the Shipping Board during the next fiscal year.

The gentleman from Iowa called attention to the fact that there is \$70,000,000 due from the War Department, and there is a possibility it might be collected between now and July 1. I appeal to the record of the hearings, gentlemen, to sustain me in my statement that the Shipping Board stated that it was expected that they might possibly derive \$60,000,000 or \$70,000,000 from the War Department during the next fiscal year. I am sure that no member of the Shipping Board expects to collect a dollar of that sum between now and July 1. But in view of his objection, and the possibility, as he says, of the payment between now and that time, I have introduced this amendment in order to carry out the intention of myself and those who favor this amendment of not permitting this Shipping Board to have one dollar over the sum I have named. This amendment is offered because we believe it is the best policy for this Congress to pursue. This Congress and no other Congress has ever adopted the policy of making appropriations and giving governmental agencies the right to draw upon certain indefinite and undetermined sums in order to carry them through the fiscal year. What Congress should do, what we seek to do by this amendment, is to make an appropriation for the amount we think they ought to have and will need during the next fiscal year, and then require every dollar by way of receipts, whether it is \$70,000,000 or \$200,000,000, to be paid into the Treasury to the credit of the Treasury as a part of the miscellaneous receipts.

I submit that the remarks made by the gentleman from Iowa to the effect that this was an effort to increase the appropriation carried in this bill are incorrect. He is mistaken in that. It is true—and that may be the idea of the majority of the committee in proposing this provision in the bill—that on paper the provision of the bill reduces the amount, or, rather, it results in a further reduction in the estimates, but when it comes to paying the money out of the Treasury it does not save the people one dollar. And for my part I believe it is better to be fair with the people, fair with the public, and make direct appropriations and hold the Shipping Board to strict account for the amount of money received by them rather than by a sort of camouflage to seek to make the public believe that we have reduced this appropriation in the sum of \$200,000,000, when we have not saved them one dollar.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 35, yeas 68.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask leave for those who have spoken on this amendment to revise and extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that request is not in order in the committee.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Then I ask leave to revise and extend my own remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I would like a verification of the fact that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto is now closed. My recollection is that the gentleman from Iowa asked that all debate on the amendment offered by the

gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] be closed in one hour. That is my recollection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the Chair is very clear that the question was put as follows: "The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOON] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close at the end of one hour." And that was provided as stated.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, a few days ago I introduced a resolution, House resolution 543, bearing upon the section that is now before this body—the question of cost-plus contracts. It is in relation to the contract for repairs on the *Leviathan*. The *Leviathan*, as is known by many members of this committee, is a ship over 970 feet long, and drawing 37.9 feet of water. There is not a harbor in the country with a dock large enough to take this ship in to repair except the dock that is now owned by the United States Government in Boston Harbor. Yet the specifications that were sent out for the repair of this ship are now in the hands of the corporation known as the International Mercantile Marine, and if you want a set of specifications in order to bid upon the reconditioning of this ship you are obliged to go to the office of this corporation in New York.

[Senate hearings, S. J. Res. 155, p. 91.]

At least some of the members of the United States Shipping Board are known to have urged the acceptance of this offer. We are informed that the International Mercantile Marine was so confident last week that its offer would be accepted, at least for the *Leviathan*, that some of its employees were sent to the ship, now in this port, to make arrangements for taking her over.

The chairman of the board of the International Mercantile Marine Co. is Harold A. Sanderson, a British subject, resident of London. The president is P. A. S. Franklin, a citizen of New York. The finance committee includes Mr. Sanderson, of London; J. P. Morgan; Charles Steel (Mr. Morgan's partner); and Mr. E. C. Grenfell (Mr. Morgan's London partner), another British subject and resident of London.

The net profits of the International Mercantile Marine (after paying British excess war profits, which one year amounted to more than \$80,000,000), have averaged in the past five years about \$22,000,000, the lowest being \$15,000,000 and the highest \$33,000,000 in any year.

The most valuable asset of the International Mercantile Marine are the fine steamers of the White Star Line, every share of whose stock is deposited in the treasury of the International Mercantile Marine, the so-called American holding company; but the executive committee, in absolute control of the operations of this company, are Harold Sanderson, chairman and managing director; E. C. Grenfell (Morgan's London partner); Lord Pirrie; and Alexander Kerr, all four being British subjects. There is not an American on the board.

There you will be told whether or not you can have a set of the specifications, and unless they say so it is impossible for any shipbuilder in this country to bid on the ship. For this work the Shipping Board agree to pay \$30,000 per month.

[From the New York Sun and Herald, May 7, 1920.]

#### NO BIG PROFITS IN "LEVIATHAN" REPAIRS.

W. F. Gibbs, chief constructor of the International Mercantile Marine Co., said yesterday that Representative TAGUE, of Massachusetts, who said in the House that certain shipyards had planned to make immense profits over the reconditioning of the *Leviathan*, biggest steamship afloat, evidently had been misinformed.

"Cost-plus bids," Mr. Gibbs said, "will not be entertained, notwithstanding Representative TAGUE's reported declaration. The reconditioning of the *Leviathan* will be the greatest task of its kind ever attempted in this country, and because of its magnitude we, acting as agents of the United States Shipping Board, have determined to have the work done at as low a cost as possible. After a committee of the best constructing representatives of the various shipyards of the country had thoroughly inspected the ship lying at Hoboken the plans and specifications for the reconditioning were drawn up. When completed the ship will be the finest in the world, superior to what she was under the German flag, and may cost between five million and ten million dollars."

Mr. Gibbs said that among those asked to bid were the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, the New York Shipbuilding Co., the Todd Ship Yards Corporation, and the Morse Dry Dock & Repair Co.

In the hearings before the Senate committee it was brought out in the examination of Mr. Hague, head of the Division of Construction and Repair, United States Shipping Board, that what I have said of the Boston Harbor he also said, that in order to repair this ship properly it could be done at the one port in this country on the Atlantic seaboard, and that was Boston.

The CHAIRMAN. Haven't we built any dock in this country where she could dock? Are we building such a dock?

Mr. HAGUE. She could come in at Norfolk in case the channel was dredged.

The CHAIRMAN. I mean, are we building any dry docks where there is ample channel to get up so that she can be docked?

Mr. HAGUE. The dry dock at Hunters Point at San Francisco would take her, and also the dock, the new naval dock at Boston, if she could get up the channel. Those were the three docks that the Navy Department told me about.

The hearings I have quoted were held before the Senate Committee on Commerce, relative to Senate joint resolution 155. You will note that Mr. Hague states that the Commonwealth Dock at Boston could dock the *Leviathan* if she could be brought

into the dock, but he rather deprecates the fact that such could not be done. It is apparent to me that Mr. Hague has not studied the situation at Boston or he would know that we have a 40-foot channel there and can bring this vessel into the Commonwealth Dock with plenty of room in almost any tide. In addition, there are all facilities at the Commonwealth Dock for the reconditioning of the *Leviathan*, and it is therefore going to unheard-of limits for private interests to undertake these repairs when to do the work at any other place than Boston unnecessary extravagance will be caused by the necessary erection of workshops, machinery, and so forth, besides the recruiting of workmen, which can be avoided if the vessel is sent to Boston.

Seven concerns have been called upon to bid on the work upon this ship, and seven concerns only, and only one of the seven asked to bid on the ship has depth enough of water at its docks to accommodate it, and not one a dry dock large enough to dock this ship. It has been said in the Senate committee hearings, page 12, part 1, that the Shipping Board has asked these gentlemen to make up the specifications for the repairs on this ship.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. How much did you say it would cost to recondition that ship?

Mr. FERGUSON. Judge Payne said \$7,500,000. We did not bid on it ourselves, for the reason that we could not get her into our harbor. We, however, assisted, as these other shipbuilders should, in preparing plans and specifications for reconditioning and fitting her as an oil burner. We have all joined together, and I think at least five of those shipyards loaned technical engineers and experts for the purpose of making these plans and specifications for reconditioning. It is a tremendous job, almost as big a job as designing and planning and building a ship in the first place.

In other words, they make up their own specifications, and then they make their own bids and figures, and no one outside of that little coterie is able to figure, and even though he did he would be unable to compete with these seven corporations that have drawn up the specifications. In other words, they would be working in the dark.

Now, the Government has purchased the big dock in Boston Harbor. We appropriated a large amount of money for the great shops and machinery at that dock, and in order to repair the *Leviathan* it must be sent to Boston for repair; and if she is going to Boston for repair, under the specifications drawn for the Shipping Board, or rather by the International Mercantile Marine, you are going to repair this ship in a dock owned by the United States Government and pay private capital for doing it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Who is responsible for this?

Mr. TAGUE. I suppose the Shipping Board.

Mr. BLANTON. Did not the gentleman just vote to put about \$150,000,000 more into their hands?

Mr. TAGUE. I shall vote to give them any amount of money they want and to see that it is judiciously expended; and that is what I am trying to do here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TAGUE. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. There will be no more unanimous consents granted on this side if that is going to be your procedure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two gentlemen are present, a quorum. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAGUE. Now, Mr. Chairman, my objection to this kind of work is the fact that the Government can do this work in its own yard and save the Government almost \$2,000,000 in the performance of the work. This work under the present arrangements is to be done at a price that is to be set by the men drawing the specifications, with no competition whatsoever.

Now, further than that, there were hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of material taken out of the *Leviathan* when she was made into a transport, and these fittings are supposed to be stored somewhere in Hoboken. No one knows whether they are to be used over again. No one can tell just where those fittings are; but still they are the fittings which came out of the ship. They were good coming out; they are in good condition now; and they should be put back into the ship. But the specifications, so far as I know, do not call for that.



Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman realize that he is framing a pretty serious indictment of the Shipping Board; that he is reviving here the scandals that are going about as to the way in which contracts for repairs are being made?

Mr. TAGUE. I would say to the gentleman that I am just stating what was told before the Senate Committee on Commerce by Mr. Hague, who said that the Shipping Board had selected experts from certain corporations to draw the specifications, and that he expected three bids.

Mr. MONDELL. The same corporations that were to do the work?

Mr. TAGUE. The same corporations that are now bidding on the work, so I understand, loaned their experts to prepare the specifications.

Mr. MONDELL. And while the material that would be needed is available, Uncle Sam is supposed to buy new material and allow that other material to be junked?

Mr. TAGUE. I have not stated that; but I said there is no mention as to whether these fittings are to be used or not.

Mr. MONDELL. That is the usual practice, I presume, of the Shipping Board on matters of that kind.

Mr. TAGUE. I am not an expert on that. What I am speaking for is to have this work done where it should properly be done and where the Government would save money. We have a splendidly equipped yard in Boston—the navy yard—and the Government has spent millions of dollars in equipping it to do this kind of work. The work on this ship is to be paid for by the Government. The repairs must of necessity be made in a Government yard and in a Government dock.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. Does it require legislation to enable the board in charge to take this ship to Boston and repair it there?

Mr. TAGUE. No; they have complete authority over the ship.

Mr. JUUL. Then, if they have complete authority over the ship, all that is necessary is for the Shipping Board to act.

Mr. TAGUE. I have asked a committee of this House to investigate it, and have presented a resolution to that end, and the resolution is now pending before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. By the action taken by the committee to-day in reducing authorizations and restricting the appropriation, if that is to be the action and judgment of Congress, there will be no money to expend on that vessel in that way unless it is expended by some private purchaser or some one who may lease the *Leviathan* and recondition her. Whatever is expended in reconditioning this and other of the ex-German ships should be expended by the purchasers.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I do not care whether the money is expended or not. I believe it should be expended, and that the ship should be put in condition for sale if it is to be sold.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. BROWNE. Is it not a fact that the dry dock at Norfolk could do this work that you claim could be done only in Boston?

Mr. TAGUE. No.

Mr. BROWNE. It is the largest dry dock in the world.

Mr. TAGUE. I know they have less than 35 feet of water there, and this vessel draws over 37 feet. Boston has a 40-foot channel, so that it is the only port on this coast that could dock her, and it has the only dock that could do the work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BROWNE. I wish, Mr. Chairman, to digress for just one minute to call the attention of the Members present to one of the most distinguished living soldiers of the Civil War, who is now in the gallery. I refer to ex-Gov. William H. Upham, of Wisconsin. [Applause, the Members rising.]

I want to say this, that Gov. Upham, in April, 1861, when a boy of 19 years of age, enlisted in the Union Army. He was wounded at the Battle of Bull Run and was left on the battle field as dead, and funeral services were held in his memory by the people in his own town and vicinity, they thinking he was dead. He was taken by the enemy to Libby Prison, where he was confined for seven months. At the end of that period he was exchanged and came to the city of Washington, where he called upon Senator James Doolittle, of Wisconsin, whom he accompanied to the White House, where he was introduced to President Abraham Lincoln. President Lincoln talked with young Upham and said that he was going to send him to school, and thereupon appointed him to the United States Military Academy at West Point, where he was graduated in 1866. He served in the United States Army after graduation until 1869, and then resigned and retired to private life. Maj. Upham then went up into northern Wisconsin, which was at that time a wilderness, locating at Marshfield, where he built up a large and extensive business, which is in existence to-day. He never asked for office, but the people of Wisconsin, in 1894, elected him governor of the State of Wisconsin, in which capacity he served with honor to himself and the State of Wisconsin.

While stationed at Fortress Monroe, Va., soon after the close of the Civil War, he had the pleasure of meeting the Confederate President, Jefferson Davis, while Davis was a prisoner of the United States, and was the officer who had the custody of President Davis. To-day he is over 79 years of age, hale and hearty, and I am proud of the opportunity of introducing my distinguished constituent, William H. Upham, to the Members of the House of Representatives. We call him "the Grand Old Man of Wisconsin." [Applause.]

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I think it is a beautiful commentary on our present American fellowship to see both sides of the House, Republicans and Democrats, northerners and southerners, rise to do honor to this brave man, Gov. Upham, of Wisconsin, who refused to die on the battle field and lived for the good of his country.

But I rise to call attention to persons not in the gallery but in some of the operating offices of the Federal prisons of this country—to some of the civil soldiers of the present war against high prices and the daily problem of comfortable living.

They are the clerks in these Federal prisons whose salaries were not raised last fall when we raised the salaries of the guards; and because I must leave in a few moments to keep an engagement that I made a year ago to deliver a patriotic address I simply want to register my conviction that when the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] offers his amendment to raise their salaries from \$75 a month to \$100 a month I believe every friend of these faithful, hard-working servants of the Government will vote for that amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPSHAW. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I want my distinguished friend from Georgia at the same time to remember the thousands of patriotic farmers down in the goober-grabbling State who are now staggering under a load of taxation which they can hardly bear. [Applause.]

Mr. UPSHAW. And I will take my place beside those farmers and help them to see the point, and they will applaud my efforts to help these clerks who are taking care of these Federal prisons and doing the necessary work for the safety of this country, and who are working for the same salaries that they got several years ago, when these farmers were getting for their cotton and others for their food products all over the land about one-third of what they are getting now.

Mr. BLANTON. And when the gentleman was wearing his overalls. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. UPSHAW. Yes; and I want to say to the gentleman concerning the overalls, inasmuch as he has introduced an irrelevant matter, that when I spoke here the other day with overalls on I mentioned both overalls and old-clothes clubs, and every day since then I have worn either overalls or old clothes on the floor of this House and in my office, and sometimes in speaking to public audiences. And I have been assured by a newspaper man who has watched the trend of things, that the thought of the Nation was arrested by it, and much practical good has come. Not only has John Wanamaker since that time made a sweeping reduction of 20 per cent in the necessities of life, but shoes in another city have been reduced about 33½ per cent, and the papers every day tell that there has been a general

reduction and a lessening of the burdens on the struggling masses of this country.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the gentleman got a first-page notice in every newspaper in the land.

Mr. UPSHAW. I decline to yield further. Any man who has sense enough to get out of a shower of rain knows that I put on that suit of overalls, along with thousands of others, purely in a spirit of rollicking fun, and yet with a very definite purpose to shake my fist at the high cost of living and the wild delirium of extravagance. If somebody complains that the price of the workingman's necessary apparel was raised by the experiment, I answer that the slight rise there is far more than offset by the greater reduction in things that cost a great deal more. I stand squarely by my purpose to express my fellowship for the man who, unsung and uncrowned, does the world's manual labor every day. And I stand without apology, with many of my congressional colleagues, in a purpose to wear old clothes the whole summer and thus set a wholesome example in sane economy for the whole country.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPSHAW. I decline to yield—I must catch my train in a few minutes.

Mr. JUUL. I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. UPSHAW. I decline to yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that a delegation be sent down to hold the train. [Laughter.]

Mr. UPSHAW. All right. If they do I want to say this, that these men who are working now, in these times of unspeakably high prices, for the same salaries that they got five years ago will meet me at the train when I get to Atlanta and thank me for being a friend of the men in overalls. [Applause.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPSHAW. Not just now; and I want to say that neither the gentleman from Texas nor the gentleman from Massachusetts nor any other man on the floor of this House ought to be content to go to the office of the Sergeant at Arms and draw \$625 for his month's services if he is unwilling to vote for this amendment that raises the salaries of these hard-working Government clerks from \$75 to \$100 a month. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, National Museum, \$415,120.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do so for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question.

As all the Members know, while the war was on the publications of the Bureau of Ethnology have been limited, and in some cases completely stopped. I am wondering if this appropriation provides for the continued publication of those reports. As one who is somewhat interested in that subject I know that those reports are splendid documents, and there is a great demand for them by those who appreciate their value and know of them; and while I realize the shortage of paper and the desire to economize, I am wondering whether or not, in the interest of education and of the general desire for knowledge on this subject, the bureau will continue to print these publications, which were suspended on account of the war. And I am asking if these publications are provided for out of this appropriation?

Mr. GOOD. These publications are not provided for out of this appropriation. They are paid for out of the appropriations for printing and binding, which are carried further on in the bill, on page 171, where an amount is carried which is thought to be sufficient to continue them. The committee believe, as the gentleman has expressed, that these publications are of great value, and they have carried an appropriation sufficient for their continuance.

Mr. HICKS. And they will be continued from now on?

Mr. GOOD. There is no question about that.

The Clerk read as follows:

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.: For the construction of a steel hangar to accommodate one United States Navy type "C-2" airship, \$125,000.

Mr. HICKS. I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman a question in regard to this item. Coming, as I see it does, under the head of armories and arsenals, I presume, of course, it is for the use of the Army. I am wondering what is the special need of putting that in this bill, because I thought that the Army bill provided for all aviation for the Army.

Mr. GOOD. Not for proving grounds or arsenals or armories. The sundry civil bill carries the appropriations for such purposes.

Mr. HICKS. I understand that; but just why do we need a great hangar out there for a naval type of airship to cost \$125,000, in addition to what both the Army and Navy already have?

Mr. GOOD. This is now practically the ordnance proving ground of the Army. It is a great proving ground, and they have there an airship, but they have no hangar. What they are trying to develop now is bombing sites. They can not develop a bombing site unless they use the airship itself and the bomb in the experiments, and they have no hangar for the ship that is there. The gentleman must remember that for a ship of this kind, designed to carry a bomb weighing about 4,000 pounds, it means a pretty large ship, and will require something of a structure to house it.

Mr. HICKS. I am not surprised at the largeness of the amount. I am surprised at the smallness of it; but my query was why we needed it at all, because I supposed all that experimental work would be carried on by the air division of the Army.

Mr. GOOD. Not this work, and at the same time they are working there to develop this new site. The committee had no desire to put in an item of this kind, but it was very forcefully presented to the committee and urgently requested, and inasmuch as we have the airship and have no hangar, it did seem to the committee that we ought to make some provision for the preservation of the little we have in the way of airships and airplanes.

Mr. HICKS. I will say to the gentleman that I am greatly in favor of the experimental work for aviation. I do not regard the sum spent for development wasted, because I believe there is where the real service can be had. The reason I said \$125,000 was a small sum for a hangar is because they are constructing a very large one at Lakehurst which will cost many times that.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. My profession alone, if there were no other intelligent reason, would lead me to an ardent advocacy of a Public Health Service. There are few greater problems for a civilized people to solve than that of its public health. It comprehends the conservation not only of the public happiness, but of public energy, of public activity, and of every form of production. There is no argument against the supreme desirability involved in such a problem. But I am afraid the Public Health Service as now constituted and administered is more of a soft berth than of a public benefit. Even the slight investigation I have made reveals 2,300 physicians on the pay rolls of this service at an annual salary of \$2,000, amounting to \$4,600,000 per year. This does not include, as I understand it, the salaries of certain superiors and many subordinates, as well as all the other expenses of this service. In addition, I also understand that the expenses of the Public Health Service do not include any of the moneys appropriated for medical and surgical purposes in the Army, in the Navy, or in the Quarantine Service. I find also that the Public Health Service has a large number of other physicians who are designated as national public health physicians, located in our cities and towns and engaged in private practice, but who receive a compensation only for individual and sporadic services, receiving no fixed salary. My judgment is, Mr. Chairman, that this department of the Government is essentially wrong as it is now conceived and extravagantly wrong in its administration. I am of the opinion that the whole question of the Public Health Service should be carefully inquired into at the very earliest moment with a view of making such a service an efficient factor in our civilization and a certain blessing to all the people. If such an investigation is made I would not take the opinions of those engaged in the Public Health Service itself. My limited observation of governmental matters leads me to the conclusion that Government employees are generally and naturally prejudiced witnesses. I would embrace in the scope of such an inquiry the medical scientists of the country, whose opinions would have quite as much scientific weight and less personal consideration. My belief is that a large part of these employees now upon the pay roll of the Public Health Service should be dismissed, the service contracted as now conducted, and in place of the present activities a real scientific agency created that will secure real and inexpressible benefits to the whole people. I find on page 30 of this bill the following:

Biologic products: To regulate the propagation and sale of viruses, serums, toxins, and analogous products, and for the preparation of curative and diagnostic biologic products, including personal service, \$35,000.

What a pitiful sum—\$35,000—to be expended in what seems to be biologic work, including personal service! What we need is to revolutionize this whole service. We should get rid of its padded pay rolls and establish the finest biological and bacteriological laboratories in the world by spending money enough to attract and secure the ablest and most devoted scientists who are engaged in this sort of work and allow them to devote their constant effort to the discoveries of serums,



viruses, antitoxins, and any other products that will prove to be specific to the fatal diseases of man and beast. And when such discoveries are made their preparation should be left to the various laboratories in the country conducted by private enterprise, and their administration to the individual physicians, whether men or women, engaged in civil practice. If I had my way I would get rid at once of this army of peripatetic doctors rambling over the country, doing little or no good that is not already done by the local physicians and boards of health. And, moreover, I would put no limit to the salary sufficient to secure a great scientist, whether English or French, whether German or Italian, famed in biological or bacteriological work. The only prerequisites I would require would be his acknowledged attainment, his character, and, above all, his devotion to such research. You are all familiar with that unutterable blessing, the diphtheria antitoxin. The Public Health Service did not discover this boon to humanity, nor, in my judgment, could it do so in a thousand years as now constituted. Before its discovery death was the universal apprehension in every household where diphtheria revealed itself. Often whole families were nearly depleted. To-day this disease is regarded almost with indifference if the antitoxin is at hand and is used properly. There is no way of computing the human happiness this remedial agent has brought to the world, nor the vast material gain as well, by the saving of the young life of humanity. What was possible in this direction can be made possible, I believe, in pneumonia, typhoid fever, syphilis, tuberculosis, cancer, and other fatal diseases of the human family, as well as in those diseases which destroy the domestic animals with such a fearful resulting loss to the public. I have a vision—a great laboratory that shall excel the world in resulting discoveries, because we have concentrated our efforts and our wealth to this end by obtaining the devotion and the intellect regardless of cost. Money spent in this way would yield an incalculable return if only one specific remedy for one fatal disease, either of man or beast, were discovered in a century. [Applause.]

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DALLINGER: Page 48, line 3, after the figures "\$17,000," insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"For the construction of a physical and testing laboratory, for the procurement and installation of equipment for same, including necessary alterations to existing buildings forming a part of the project, \$300,000."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I was very much surprised and disappointed to discover when this bill was reported that the item covered by the amendment which I have offered was not included in the bill, because I thought that the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], and the other members of the subcommittee had been favorably impressed at the hearings by the testimony as to the necessity of providing adequate facilities at the Watertown Arsenal for carrying on experiments with war materials in order that the lessons arising out of the Great War can be taken advantage of for the benefit of our country in the future. As I understand it, the argument against putting in this \$300,000 item, which was strenuously advocated by all of the officials of the Ordnance Department, is that this laboratory had been the only laboratory at the Watertown Arsenal, and that the Government has gotten along with it up to the present time. That argument falls to the ground, in my opinion, because we never have had adequate laboratory facilities, and the experiments which, it is admitted even by the committee, are all important are to-day being made and have always been made under a great handicap. This laboratory is now in a building that was constructed during the War of 1812—over 100 years ago. It has been totally inadequate for a generation. The unnecessary expense to the Government of using this totally inadequate building has been very great and will continue to be very great. The taxpayers of the country have spent between \$20,000,000 and \$30,000,000 upon this arsenal at Watertown, and the plant is modern and up to date, with the exception of this laboratory and an old blacksmith shop, which is equipped with inadequate machinery. They are the only two buildings that are not up to date in this entire plant. Even admitting that we are not going to manufacture munitions of war at Watertown to any extent in the near future, it must be evident to anyone that it is of vital importance that experimental work shall be carried on there.

Mr. Chairman, it is not good business and it is not sound economy to continue to use these old buildings, that were constructed during the War of 1812. I sincerely trust that the chairman of the committee will not press his point of order and will agree that this absolutely necessary item shall go into the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I can not take that course. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the work of furnishing headstones of durable stone or other durable material for unmarked graves of Union and Confederate soldiers, sailors, and marines in national, post, city, town, and village cemeteries, naval cemeteries at navy yards and stations of the United States, and other burial places, under the acts of March 3, 1873, February 3, 1879, and March 9, 1906; continuing the work of furnishing headstones for unmarked graves of civilians interred in post cemeteries under the acts of April 28, 1904, and June 30, 1906; and furnishing headstones for the unmarked graves of Confederate soldiers, sailors, and marines in national cemeteries, \$100,000.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McKEOWN: Page 50, line 12, after the period, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"For furnishing headstones of durable stone or other durable material for the graves of soldiers, sailors, and marines of the war with Germany in national, city, town, and village cemeteries, naval cemeteries, at navy yards and stations of the United States, where, on account of the financial condition of relatives or other circumstances, no headstones can be erected, \$50,000."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I want to state to the committee that it occurred to me that this ought to be done. This matter was called to my attention by a letter recently received from a constituent—a poor family whose son was lost in the war. They asked if there would be any markers for those boys' graves, and stated that they did not have money enough to mark their son's grave when his body was returned. This will require a very small amount, and will be needed only in those cases where, on account of poverty of the immediate family or relatives, there would be no suitable marker of the grave.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, that is taken care of in the preceding paragraph.

Mr. McKEOWN. Does the gentleman think the language in the preceding paragraph will cover that?

Mr. GOOD. That is my understanding. That was the opinion of the officer who will have charge of the administration of the funds.

Mr. McKEOWN. Upon that assurance, then, I will withdraw the amendment, because I do not want to have it inserted if it is unnecessary.

Mr. GOOD. The committee made inquiry with regard to that very matter, and Col. Lemley said that the appropriation would be used not only to purchase headstones for the deceased soldiers of former wars but also for the war with Germany.

Mr. McKEOWN. If that is true, I will not compel the gentleman to make the point of order, but will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield so that I may ask the chairman of the committee a question?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Why not place the language in the text of the bill, so that it will be beyond the construction of any individual officer and show the intention of the appropriation in the written law of the land? That could be done by a very slight amendment to the section.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; by striking out, in line 3, the words "Union and Confederate."

Mr. McKEOWN. The word "Union" there is used primarily to mean those who lost their lives in the Civil War.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; but under that term they are providing headstones for the graves of soldiers of the Spanish-American War and, I understand, the late war.

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes; under the broad language, if it is given a broad interpretation, the word "Union" would include soldiers of the Spanish-American War and also these soldiers, but it ought to be absolutely plain, as suggested by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Miller]. There seems to be an opinion that it does not cover it now.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have not had time to look up the hearings since the gentleman called my attention to it, but my recollection is that out of the \$21,549,000 they expect to spend something for headstones in connection with the interment of soldiers of this war, but as to that I am not certain.

Mr. McKEOWN. Would the gentleman have any objection to passing this question until he can look into it further?

Mr. GOOD. No; I have not. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph, commencing with line 1 and ending with line 12, page 50, be passed over temporarily.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The paragraph and the amendment both?

Mr. GOOD. The paragraph and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the paragraph, beginning at the top of page 50 and ending with line 12, and the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma pending, shall be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. DOWELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Dudley, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4212. An act to authorize the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey to construct a bridge across the waters of the Delaware River, between the city of Easton, in the State of Pennsylvania, and the city of Phillipsburg, in the State of New Jersey; and

S. 3897. An act to amend sections 16 and 26 of the act of Congress approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm-loan act. The bill simply provides a method by which the joint-stock land banks may go into voluntary liquidation.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 11960) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. LODGE, Mr. BORAH, and Mr. HITCHCOCK as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of any appropriation for national cemeteries or the repair of roadways thereto shall be expended in the maintenance of more than a single approach to any national cemetery.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word merely to ask the chairman of the committee just why that proviso was put in there, that there should be but one approach to a national cemetery? I can conceive of a situation where it might be necessary to have two approaches.

Mr. GOOD. The trouble was a practice was growing up whereby roadways were being paved and repaired over private roads leading to national cemeteries, and there were abuses. Now, it was thought one entrance was sufficient. Some of these roadways extend some distance over State roads and county roads. County and State roads were being repaired out of the appropriation, and this provision was put in to prevent that sort of thing, and it has been carried for some time in the interest of economy and efficiency.

Mr. HICKS. I merely ask for information, because it seemed a rather unusual proviso. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Disposition of remains of officers, soldiers, and civilian employees: For interment, cremation (only upon request from relatives of the deceased), or of preparation and transportation to their homes or to such national cemeteries as may be designated by proper authority, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, of the remains of officers, cadets, United States Military Academy, including acting assistant surgeons and enlisted men in active service, and accepted applicants for enlistment; interment, or of preparation and transportation to their homes, of the remains of civil employees of the Army in the employ of the War Department who die abroad, in Alaska, in the Canal Zone, or on Army transports, or who die while on duty in the field or at military posts within the limits of the United States; interment of military prisoners who die at military posts; for the interment and shipment to their homes of remains of enlisted men who are discharged in hospitals in the United States and continue as inmates of said hospitals to the date of their death, and for interment of prisoners of war and interned alien enemies who die at prison camps in the United States; removal of remains from abandoned posts to permanent military posts or national cemeteries, including the remains of Federal soldiers, sailors, or marines, interred in fields or abandoned private and city cemeteries; and in any case where the expenses of burial or shipment of the remains of officers or enlisted men of the Army who die on the active list are borne by individuals, where such expenses would have been lawful claims against the Government, reimbursement to such individuals may be made of the amount allowed by the Government for such services out of this sum, but no reimbursement shall be made of such expenses incurred prior to July 1, 1910; expenses of the segregation of bodies in permanent American cemeteries in France; in all, \$21,549,000: *Provided*, That the above provisions shall be applicable in the cases of officers and enlisted men on the retired list of the Army who have died or may hereafter die while on active duty by proper assignment and also to citizens of the United States who may have died while serving in the armies of the allies associated with the American forces: *Provided further*, That, in addition to the foregoing sum, the unobligated balance of the appropriation "Disposition of remains of officers, soldiers, and civil employees," for the fiscal year 1920 is made available during the fiscal year 1921 for the care and maintenance of graves of

officers, soldiers, and civilian employees of the Army abroad, and for the preparation and shipment of their remains to their homes or to national cemeteries: *Provided further*, That there may be expended from and after the approval of this act and until June 30, 1921, from this appropriation and the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1920, a total amount not exceeding \$100,000 for personal services in the Cemeterial Division, Office of the Quartermaster General, War Department, for compiling, recording, preparing, and transmitting data incident to the disposition of the remains referred to herein; this sum may be expended notwithstanding the third proviso of the paragraph entitled "Temporary employees, War Department," contained in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the word "internment," line 25, page 51, be changed to "interment." It is a typographical error. Also that the word "of," in line 1, page 52, be stricken out after the word "or," and the word "interment" be correctly spelled in line 7, and that the word "of," in line 7, after the word "or," be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the corrections be made to the text of the bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, line 25, strike out the word "internment" and insert in lieu thereof the word "interment"; page 52, line 1, strike out the word "of" after the word "or"; page 52, line 7, strike out the word "interment" and insert in lieu thereof the word "interment"; page 52, line 7, after the word "or" strike out the word "of."

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I also ask to return to page 43, line 22, for the purpose of correcting the spelling of the word "fiscal" in that line.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 43, line 22, correct the spelling of the word "fiscal."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 24, after the word "exceeding" strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$500,000."

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I hope I may have the listening ear of the members of the Committee on Appropriations and the attention of the members of this Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. On page 53, I seek to amend, in line 24, by striking out "\$100,000" and substituting "\$500,000." This relates to the provision in the bill which takes care of the soldier dead and also some civilians in different sections of the world. The largest part of it relates to the care of the soldier dead buried in France and the return to this country of their remains. Every Member of this House is familiar with the fact that by reason of the World War there are now buried abroad over 75,000 soldiers in France. It had been expected that they would be returned to this country, wherever the relatives of the dead have requested it, and at an earlier period than now, but there was some objection on the part of the French Government. That objection has been removed. There has been an absolute agreement on the part of the authorities of the French Government and the authorities of this country—the Secretary of War and the Secretary of State. There is no longer any controversy.

The work is now going on. The only delay is the question of time. Permission has been given and the work has been going on with reference to all the dead except where they are within the war zone. The time has been postponed for going into the war zone to the 15th of September. The estimate made by the War Department carried in this bill—and I hope I may have the attention of every member of the committee—the estimate carried in this bill in the aggregate is \$30,000,000 for all the purposes mentioned in the two pages or more covering all the items and all of the expense. There is now no controversy about it. At one time it looked as if no part of this appropriation could be made available for the work of the personnel here in the District of Columbia because of a provision in the legislative bill, and an amendment was inserted in this bill to meet that provision so that a part of the \$30,000,000 in the aggregate could be used to pay the personnel here in the District of Columbia. But in the final analysis the Committee on Appropriations limited that expenditure to \$100,000. This work abroad can not be done unless the force here is paid. There is no use having in this appropriation bill \$30,000,000 or more provided for this great service if you do not permit it to be expended, and a sufficient amount to be expended, to do this work here; \$100,000 is \$1 for every \$300 of the entire amount. The department states that that would only last for about three months.



Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?  
 Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. I yield.  
 Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. How much did the War Department ask?

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. I was going to get to that in one moment, if the gentleman will pardon me. This bill provides for a period of about 13½ months, from now until the 1st of July, 1921. The \$8,000,000 and over of this fiscal year is made available for the fiscal year ending the 30th day of June, 1921. The War Department has said that it will take approximately \$100,000 for each three months, or approximately \$500,000 for the entire period to July, 1921, nearly 14 months, and that if it is limited to \$100,000 then the work will stop, because the offices here will have to close or the force be cut down and the work delayed. It is true that it is possible that they might move their offices to some other town under the technical authority of law, but it would be an additional expense, and it would be a delay, and it would be a loss of a portion of those employed in this work here who could not follow the service.

I want to call your attention to a statement made in a letter by the Secretary of War:

I have already called to the attention of Congress one matter which should be corrected, in view of the probable disruption of this project as the result of a clause in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill for the year ending June 30, 1921. This bill prohibits the payment of civilian personnel in the bureaus or offices of the War Department in the District of Columbia, with certain exceptions. It is noted that part of the Quartermaster Corps, known as the graves registration service, which is supervising the disposition of the remains of soldiers buried overseas because the necessary data for field operations could not be turned out by the central office, upon which the field force in France is dependent for its official and revised information, I have suggested that a certain amendment may be made to the sundry civil bill whereby this particular feature of work may be excepted from prohibition against the use of civilian employees in the District of Columbia, so that the work may normally progress and the department may be relieved from the possibility of a great public clamor, in case the progress of that work is unnecessarily interrupted. This is one of the most pressing difficulties by which the project is menaced at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. I will ask the gentleman if he can not get through in five minutes?

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. I will try to do so. There are so many who do not understand this that I want to read what the Secretary of War says.

Mr. GOOD. I do not want to object, but we have read only 10 pages of the bill to-day, and I hope the gentleman can get through in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. I was going to read what the Secretary said, but I will omit that in order to get on further.

To be more specific, I will read and insert a fuller statement:

1. Your attention is invited to the proviso in the sundry civil bill (H. R. 13870), introduced April 20, 1920, lines 20 to 26, inclusive, page 53, and lines 1 to 6, inclusive, on page 54. This proviso contains a new provision, which is intended to authorize payment of civilian force in the cemeterial division of this office from funds appropriated for bringing home remains of our soldier dead, but it limits the amount to \$100,000. The cemeterial division is the activity of this office heretofore generally known to the public and spoken of as the "graves registration service."

2. One hundred thousand dollars is not sufficient for clerical hire necessary in the District of Columbia in connection with the clerical work incident to returning American military dead from present burial places in Europe. The authorized clerical strength of the cemeterial division, this office, is 255, and the monthly pay roll amounts to \$32,384.32. In view of the provision in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill, which the proviso referred to above was designed to offset, the authorization for clerical hire in the District of Columbia to be paid from the total of \$21,549,000 estimated for under the appropriation for "disposition of remains," etc., should cover the last three months of the current fiscal year and the entire fiscal year 1921, which would make a total of 15 months, with a possible expenditure of \$485,764.80. Funds for the payment of clerical hire are included in the total of the estimate as submitted. If, therefore, a limit to the amount to be used for clerical hire in the District of Columbia is to be incorporated in the law, it should be "not to exceed \$500,000."

3. It should, however, be made clear to Congress that this is not a request for additional funds, but a request that suitable authority be granted by legislative enactment to permit the use of funds in the District of Columbia, that have already been estimated for and are about to be appropriated, for the disposition of the remains of our soldier dead, and for the care of their foreign burial places, the use of which funds for clerical hire in the District of Columbia will be expressly forbidden in the legislative, executive, and judicial act, but is desired to be authorized in the sundry civil appropriation act.

4. It is deemed absolutely essential to the efficient prosecution of this work of returning the remains of American soldier dead that the organization of the cemeterial division of the office of the Quartermaster General be not disturbed or broken up because of failure to grant suitable authority for its maintenance. The increased clerical expenses of the cemeterial division were included in the estimate for \$21,549,000 submitted in connection with the appropriations for the

"disposition of remains," etc., of our soldier dead and were not and have not been included in the estimates for the operations of the Quartermaster General of the Army or any other War Department activity. If a sufficient sum is not authorized for this continuance of the cemeterial division in the office of the Quartermaster General, it will become necessary to transfer this organization to some other city, with a view of avoiding the prohibition against the pay of its clerical force in the District of Columbia. This will mean an interruption in the supply of necessary data to our field forces abroad and a consequent serious delay in their operations, the loss of a very considerable number of the trained clerks now engaged in this work, the expense of the move, and the additional and unnecessary rental of office space, which is not available in the office of the Quartermaster General. All the foregoing would be an additional and unnecessary expense to the taxpayers.

5. It should be especially borne in mind that the prosecution of the work in Europe is absolutely dependent upon the supply of data from the records here in the United States, and that any delay in the supply of such data will increase the total cost of the work through idle time on the part of the working forces abroad or through inability to proceed with the work in accordance with plans made for its early completion.

6. It should also be borne in mind that the relatives in this country who desire the return of their dead are very insistent that this object be accomplished with the least possible delay, and will undoubtedly become clamorous should any delay occur through the lack of sufficient appropriation to prosecute the work. They are already very impatient at the delay caused by the unavoidable obstacles of distance, lack of transportation, and difficulty in securing and forwarding caskets and other supplies.

The work of this board here is an immense one. When the pay stops the work stops, and the force is discharged or reduced and delay follows. There is no use of making available this large amount already agreed on for all the estimated expense if the personnel conducting the work is to be discharged. Now, will you do that which will stop the work and prevent this large amount of money from being made available? Mark you, it does not add \$1 to the amount of this appropriation, but it permits that amount to be used for personnel here in the District of Columbia which is absolutely necessary in order to carry on this work. Mark you further, it is stated that this Congress is liable to adjourn within 30 days. If it does, and you should not meet here until next December, or if you should meet at an earlier date, even, then there being no authority of law, it being forbidden to use any amount of this money, the work stops. Is there a Member of this House, after there has been an absolute agreement between the authorities over yonder and here, who believes that this great work should stop because of a prohibition in this bill?

I do not believe that this matter was thoroughly viewed from every standpoint by every member of the Appropriations Committee. I do not believe that they want to postpone the time in which this work shall be completed. It is the hope and desire of everyone in this country that the work shall be expedited and that the anxiety of those interested be not continued. If it were an increased appropriation it might be difficult, but it is only setting aside a necessary part for absolutely necessary work to be done through the personnel here. The commendable desire on the part of the chairman of this committee for economy we all appreciate, but when you understand that it does not add a single dollar but that it permits the War Department to use a sufficient amount of this fund in order to carry on this work—

Mr. OLIVER. May I ask what inquiry the gentleman has made to ascertain that this number of clerks is absolutely required?

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. I can say this, that the Committee on Appropriations has relied entirely upon the War Department in the estimate necessary to bring back not only the dead but to care for those who are over there, and to care for and remove the dead in over a thousand cemeteries scattered through France and England and Germany, and other parts of the world. I know nothing except what the War Department says, and the reliance on the part of this House on its estimate. I read the statement that 256 employees in this department here in Washington are engaged in this great work, and the monthly expenditure is \$32,000 and more per month.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. Is it not probable that when the work reaches its fullest development a larger number of employees will be necessary and expenses will be greater?

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. In all probability; and I understand they are gathering the employees in order to hasten the work going on over yonder. It is said that it is necessary in this work to not only search the data brought from Europe by the graves registration service, but also the answers received by the office of The Adjutant General in response to the questions sent therefrom. But data must also be obtained, through correspondence or personal inquiry from The Adjutant General's office, from the records abroad. I quote from data furnished me:

I am inclosing you herewith data in explanation of the need of the cemeterial division (graves registration service, O. Q. M. G.) for an authorization of approximately \$500,000 under the appropriation, "disposition of remains," etc., sundry civil bill, for "the pay of the clerical

force in the District of Columbia necessary to compile, record, prepare, and transmit data incident to the remains of the American military dead from European burial places."

It is necessary in this work to not only search the data brought from Europe by the graves registration service but also the answers received by the office of The Adjutant General in response to the questionnaires sent therefrom. Much data must also be obtained through correspondence or personal inquiry from The Adjutant General's office from records brought from Europe by the central records office, A. E. F.; the Surgeon General's office; the Bureau of War Risk Insurance; etc. Besides this, there is a constant stream of inquiries from relatives, friends, Members of Congress, officers, Federal and State officials, and others interested in individual cases or this work in general, which must be answered.

Another point, which is perhaps of minor consideration, is the position in which the United States Government would be placed if, after obtaining through very firm diplomatic pressure on the French Government entire exception from the prohibition against the removal of remains of military dead, Congress should by an inadequate provision for clerical force paralyze the work at this end and thereby compel its cessation in Europe.

It is absolutely necessary to have a force sufficient to attend to all of these details in order to prevent mistakes being made in the identification, and for the sending daily of thousands of letters here and there and receiving the necessary information. The only way in which we can do it is to get the information, and I rely absolutely on the estimates as furnished by the department. I sincerely hope, inasmuch as it adds not one dollar additional to the entire amount, that it may meet the kindly judgment of those who have charge of this bill, and that they will consent to amounts sufficient to cover the entire 15 months, and that "not exceeding \$100,000" be changed to "not exceeding \$500,000."

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to extend the remarks which he has made in the committee on this bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not think there is anyone here who has any knowledge as to the efforts made for the bringing back of our soldier dead that will say that I have any other motives in the remarks I shall make except those that are goodly. I introduced the first resolution looking to the bringing back of our soldier dead, asking that the Government of the United States make some arrangement with the French Government whereby their old laws forbidding the exhumation and removal of bodies might be modified. And I have been following it up and doing all I could toward the bringing about of this desirable end. But I want to impress upon the committee that this is another attempt of the War Department to keep up this army of useless employees in the District of Columbia. Ever since the passage of the legislative bill, whereby we sought to retrench and cut down expenditures by releasing from the pay roll a great many of these unnecessary clerks they have been resorting to every possible means to circumvent the action of that committee and the action of this House in adopting it, in order to keep up their rolls, and that is what they are here trying to do. They are even using the sacred name of our heroic dead to keep up the pay roll in the city of Washington. I think I can demonstrate how useless it would be to have this additional authorization made. They have 256 clerks now in the cemetery division of the Quartermaster Corps.

They have no use for one-half of that number at present. They could get along perfectly well with this number and do every bit of the work that would be required of them when these bodies begin to come back from across the sea.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Are these people employed in the city of Washington, all of these 256?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes; all of the 256 are employed in the city of Washington; and it is intended that these additional people shall be employed also in the city of Washington. It is for the clerical force in the city of Washington. They have 256 clerks there now, and one-fourth of them could do all the work that is required of them.

Now, suppose we agreed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON], for whom I have the greatest sympathy and compassion? What does it mean? It means the addition down in that department, now overcrowded with useless help, of 416 more clerks. What will they do with them? What will they have to do? The gentleman has already stated, from the interviews and correspondence that he has had with the War Department, that the only purpose of these clerks is to take care of the correspondence made necessary by the bringing back of these bodies. If you allow them the

\$100,000 provided for in this bill, this sum will provide for 80 additional clerks, and I think 80 clerks would be sufficient to do all the correspondence that will be necessary.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Has the gentleman any information as to how rapidly they can be returned—as to the availability of the shipping?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That will depend entirely on the number of ships that are available. But there will be not more than 200 or 300 bodies coming back at a time.

Mr. McKEOWN. Has any estimate been furnished to the committee as to the amount of shipping that will be available to cover this number?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I have heard of none, although I have made some inquiry in that respect. That is entirely problematical. It will depend on how many ships they will be able to get and when they can get them. But at most only 250 or 300 of these bodies can be returned at one time. Imagine a force of 416 clerks, and 256 clerks in addition, taking care of the correspondence made necessary and imperative by reason of the bringing back of 250 or 300 bodies at one time! There is nobody here who wants in the least to interfere with bringing these bodies back; but I say this proposal is a mere subterfuge and an imposition on this Congress, an attempt—not the first one they have made, because they have made two or three heretofore—to retain and to increase the present clerk roll in the War Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. If I felt that they needed an additional clerk for the object in view, I would be the last man to keep them from getting him.

Mr. PARRISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. PARRISH. I am sure we all have in mind the purpose that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON] has, and that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] has, but I understand at present about \$32,000 a month is being expended in clerical assistance there. Whether it is necessary or not, I do not know. At that rate, \$32,000 a month, \$100,000 would permit this service to continue only about three months, after which time, unless some other provision is made, the work will have to stop. Is that true?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It is not true. The clerical work for the 256 that they have down there now will go on. We have made provision for this. This is in addition. In my opinion they could get along without a single additional clerk. They do not need them for this purpose, and that is not the reason why they are trying to get them, and that is not the purpose for which they are trying to get them.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. Recently we had an estimate submitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs to the effect that they could compile all the records and make complete reports concerning the 500,000 men engaged in the Navy during the war for \$300,000. That would embrace machines and all that kind of thing.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes. We gave the Navy Department in our legislative, executive, and judicial bill every cent they asked for for this service, but notwithstanding that fact, I am informed that another body has added \$300,000 for this very purpose.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I will ask to have the gentleman's time extended in order that I may get from him his views.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. My colleague [Mr. OLIVER] is entirely right. The first estimate they made was for \$750,000, to make up the records of the sailors of the Navy in this war. We declined to make an appropriation of \$750,000. Then a young man appeared, the chief of a division which has these records, and he said that for less than \$300,000 he would make up these



records within 11 months. We were disposed to think that that was quite reasonable. Now, I discover that the Committee on Appropriations has in the legislative bill furnished sufficient money to enable them to do this work.

I want to say to the gentleman from Indiana that if I should be on the conference committee and that item appears before me, before agreeing to it I will see to it that no more than the amount that is written in the bill shall be allowed for this purpose. I do not want any more duplication. I understand the gentleman was going to speak to me about it. Is that satisfactory to the gentleman?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask that all the hearings bearing on this subject be investigated as to what has been allowed or should be allowed for this purpose.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. But the legislative bill prohibits any of it, and this bill only authorizes \$100,000 of this amount.

Mr. BUTLER. I am referring to the item in the naval appropriation bill. An amendment has been added by the Senate, to which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Woon] referred a moment ago and as to which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Oliver] replied.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. How much was that?

Mr. BUTLER. Three hundred thousand dollars is the Senate amendment. In view of the fact that \$750,000 was asked for the same work, we considered that that \$300,000 was quite reasonable; but the amendment has not yet been agreed to.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Dickinson] that it is my purpose to do everything in my power to help in bringing back the remains of these boys, which ought to have been brought back long ago; but I assume that the gentleman from Missouri will be opposed to the Quartermaster Corps or any other division of the Army taking advantage of this sacred subject for the purpose of keeping up their pay roll and adding to it after appropriation for such purpose has been denied them by other legislation.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. Upon what facts or evidence does the gentleman make that statement?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I make it on the basis of the evidence produced at the hearings that were had not only in the consideration of this bill, but before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having to do with the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Now, then, can you imagine, as a common-sense business man, the necessity for 416 additional clerks for the purpose of attending to the correspondence necessary and incident to the bringing back the remains of these soldier dead?

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further, I understand that the amount that is appropriated in the present bill, \$100,000, will cover the operations as the personnel is now constituted.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That has not anything to do with it. They have a personnel of 256 down there now that is provided for in other legislation.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. What bill?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The legislative, executive, and judicial bill appropriates \$3,000,000 for additional clerk hire in the War Department. Out of this sum ample provision can be made for all the clerks necessary to do this work, in my opinion, without the authorization of a single additional dollar, but we are allowing them \$100,000 more by this measure. Certainly with this increase they can get along if they so desire.

Mr. HUDSPETH. What is the reason for providing in this bill \$100,000 additional for these clerks that had already been taken care of in another bill?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I am free to say to the gentleman that I was opposed to authorizing a dollar additional; but in obedience to the majority rule the committee thought it was better that we give them an additional \$100,000, so that they might not have even an excuse. With the appropriations that have been authorized they can employ 80 additional clerks, which will be more than sufficient. Let us save as much of this money as we can for the purpose of bringing back our

soldier dead and waste as little as possible of it in useless clerk hire.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in sympathy with all that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Woon] has said with reference to doing away with useless and unnecessary employees in the War Department, and, in fact, in every department of the Government, and I want to take this occasion to say that the subcommittee of which the gentleman from Indiana was chairman rendered a very great service in the reduction of estimates that were submitted for employees in the departments, and I was very glad to give my hearty support to the bill which was prepared under his direction.

But I am not prepared to agree with what the gentleman had to say to the effect that some one in the War Department is using the names of our soldier dead for the purpose of padding estimates and securing additional or unnecessary clerks in the War Department. I am not prepared to say that the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri does not call for too much money. As a matter of fact the expenditure for this purpose in the War Department now is at the rate of about \$388,611 a year. I was talking with Mr. Davis, who is connected with the Quartermaster's Department, several days ago, and I asked him particularly as to the present pay roll, and also as to how long he thought it would be necessary to maintain it at its present rate, and he told me he thought that under ordinary circumstances, possibly in October or November they would be able to reduce the number of the clerks, but that it would be impossible, if Congress and the people of this country expected prompt action in bringing back the remains of the boys, to reduce the number in July.

Now, I think the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Woon] is mistaken in his statement that this means an additional force in the War Department for this purpose. On the contrary, the money carried in this bill will be the only appropriation that will be provided for the employment of these clerks, who are necessary to carry on the work incident to the bringing back from France of the remains of our soldier dead; and I have as authority for that statement no less a person than the Secretary of War himself. I know that the Secretary of War is interested only in securing the necessary number of clerks, and no more, for this purpose, and I want to take the liberty of reading to you just what the Secretary of War says as to the necessity of some additional force in order to provide for this very important and very essential service. Now, listen to this. He says:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, April 30, 1920.

HON. JOSEPH W. BYRNS,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BYRNS: Referring to your inquiry concerning the estimated sum required from the estimate for an appropriation of \$21,549,000 for the disposition of remains, for the payment of civilian personnel in the District of Columbia engaged to compile, record, prepare, and transmit data to the field force in Europe, upon which to base their operations for the return of the bodies of American soldier dead, you are advised that the present pay roll amounts to \$32,384.32 per month. In view of the provision in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill, which the amendment requested is desired to offset, the authorization for clerical hire, to be paid from the total estimated, as stated above, under the appropriation, "disposition of remains," should cover the three months of the current fiscal year and the entire fiscal year of 1921. This would make a total of 15 months, with a possible expenditure of \$485,764.80. The inclusion of the three months of the current fiscal year is in order to provide against any question the auditor might raise as to the provision in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill applying to disbursements prior to June 30, 1920.

If, therefore, the Committee on Appropriations should feel it their duty to limit the amount of money to be expended for clerical hire in the District of Columbia for this purpose, it might be placed at not to exceed \$500,000. It should, however, be clearly understood by the committee that this is not a request for additional funds, but a request that suitable authority be granted by legislative enactment to permit the use of funds in the District of Columbia—funds that have already been appropriated or are about to be appropriated for the disposition of the remains of our soldier dead and care of their foreign burial places, the use of which funds in the District of Columbia will be expressly forbidden in the legislative, executive, and judicial act.

It is deemed absolutely essential to the efficient prosecution of this work that the organization of the cemeterial division of the Office of the Quartermaster General be not disturbed or broken up because of failure to grant suitable authority for its maintenance. The expenses of the cemeterial division were included in the estimate for \$21,549,000—

The amount carried in this bill—submitted in connection with the appropriation for the "disposition of remains," etc., of our soldier dead and were not and have not been included in the estimates for the operation of the Office of the Quartermaster General of the Army or any other War Department activity. If authority is not obtained for the continuance of the cemeterial division in the Office of the Quartermaster General, it will become necessary to transfer this organization to some other city, with a view to avoiding the prohibition against the pay of its clerical force in the District of Columbia. This will mean a serious delay in the work of our field forces abroad, the loss of a very considerable number of the

trained clerks now engaged in this work, the expenses of the move, and the additional and unnecessary rental of office space and which office space is available in the Office of the Quartermaster General. All the foregoing would be an additional and unnecessary expense to the taxpayers.

It should also be borne in mind that the prosecution of the work in Europe is absolutely dependent upon the supply of data from the records here in the United States, and that any delay in the supply of such data will increase the total cost of the work through idle time on the part of the working forces abroad or through inability to proceed with the work in accordance with plans made for its early completion.

It should also be borne in mind that the relatives in this country who desire the return of their dead are very insistent that this object be accomplished with the least possible delay, and will undoubtedly become clamorous should any delay occur through the lack of sufficient appropriation to prosecute the work. They are already very impatient at the delay caused by the unavoidable obstacles of distance, lack of transportation, and difficulty in securing and forwarding caskets and other supplies.

Very truly, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,  
Secretary of War.

That letter was written to me upon my request for some information as to the necessity for these clerks.

This amendment of the gentleman from Missouri does not add one dollar to the appropriation carried in this bill. I have said elsewhere that possibly \$300,000 might be all that was necessary to carry them through the next fiscal year, because the peak will have been reached in the early part of the fiscal year, and in October or November they will be in a position to release some of their clerks; but in this matter of bringing back the remains of those boys who fought for their flag and died for our country in France, I had rather appropriate ten times more than the amount needed than be in the position of not giving them enough [applause]; and for that reason, rather than run the risk of delaying even for one day the bringing back of the remains of the beloved boy of some good mother, I would give the full amount that they ask and trust to the War Department to administer the law as it ought to be administered in an economical way. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to 25 minutes, 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON], 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLANTON], 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BEE], 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNOTSON], and 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Can not the gentleman limit that simply to this amendment?

Mr. GOOD. I hope the gentleman will not make any objection to my request. That will make a total of over an hour on this paragraph. It seems to me we must proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close at the end of 25 minutes, to be divided as stated by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to indorse and to emphasize part of what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] said, to the extent of asserting that Government employees' organization propaganda is even going into the sacred precincts of the resting places of our beloved dead in France in an attempt to keep some of the 100,000 emergency war clerks still on the pay roll. I have received a letter from one of the Government clerks here protesting at the action of what is known as the employees' union in collecting from their members 50 cents a month in order to carry on legislative propaganda here before the Congress—50 cents a month from each and every one of the employees affiliated with those local unions; and he sent me various printed communications from several locals attempting to change their constitutions, increasing the amount of the monthly assessments or dues. Let me show you how active some are. In this morning's Washington Post appears an article headed "Federal Employees' Union, Local No. 2, appoints a committee to urge Congress on." Let me read excerpts from one communication sent to its members by this Federal Employees' Local No. 2, being the same Local No. 2 mentioned in the Washington Post. Let me read:

There can be no valid objection to giving the national federation 25 cents per month. It should be clearly understood that Local No. 2 and the national are not two separate organizations; they are merely different parts of the same organization. It is the national that organizes and conducts our legislative campaigns; and legislative campaigns are the means which, in the main, bring us results we are working for. The national also organizes locals all over the country (we now have 128 scattered over 41 States), and it is from these locals, in large part at least, that we obtain our power; and the help of these locals is vital in every legislative program.

The increased dues do not begin until after July 1, and then the new bonus will also be in effect. The attention of all members who are so situated that they can do little of the real work of the union is called to the fact that they are profiteering handsomely from the

investment made by joining the union, for not only are they getting 313 hours of added leisure this year, but, as one member expressed it, they are also able to drop 35 cents in the slot and draw out \$10 each month. What they are asked to do during the next fiscal year is to "drop 50 cents in the slot" and draw out the new bonus and also a real reclassification program.

There is no other labor union in the country paying less than 50 cents dues per month; most of the unions pay dues of \$1 or more, and they get satisfactory results because they have adequate means for every campaign.

The above, Mr. Chairman, indicates the modus operandi of these unions of Government employees in forcing money from its members to use in operating on Congress. They reach us through every angle. They seek an unlimited amount of money to bring influence to bear upon us from every available point of the compass. They have the strongest, most pernicious lobby constantly maintained here ever known to the oldest inhabitants of this Capital. And we fall for them every year, month, week, day, hour, and almost every minute. They find some way to influence us, and always get what they want.

The Post says that this particular Local No. 2 has appointed committees "to urge Congress on." Fifty cents a month! The newspapers stated the other day that these Government employees now have 168 locals. Suppose every one of the Government employees here in Washington belonged to the union—100,000. That would be \$50,000 a month income for a slush fund for these Government unions to use in a legislative campaign "to urge Congress on," and we are being urged on right now. We are getting these communications from the clerks. They come from our own districts sometimes in the way of letters, petitions, and telegrams. They say in the communication I read that it is the locals in our district from which they get most of their power. We are being urged on and on and on, and even driven. I want to say that the time has come when we want to do everything we can and everything that is necessary to bring the bodies of our hero soldiers back from France. I have been in favor of that ever since the armistice. I have insisted for it on the floor many times and will vote to appropriate every dollar necessary, but I am also in favor of cutting loose from the pay roll every unnecessary idle clerk put on through the civil service that is not needed, and who every day are ding-donging us in order to raise the money to keep them. We ought to cut them loose and send them home. [Applause.]

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, before I use the three minutes allotted to me I want to make a short statement. As we know, to-day is Uncle JOE CANNON's birthday. As I came into the House Building this morning I saw a bust of ex-Speaker CANNON back in an out-of-the-way place near the majority room. I do not know who is responsible for putting it there but they ought to put it where every Member of the House can see it when he comes into the building as an inspiration. [Applause.]

I hope whoever has charge will take it and put it in a prominent place where Members can get the benefit of it.

Gentlemen, I can not agree with my friend from Indiana. I do not believe there is any man in the Quartermaster's Department, subject to the influence that the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BLANTON, talked about, who is willfully padding the pay roll to keep the men in its employ. I do not know how much money they ought to have to bring back the bodies of the boys in France, but so far as I am concerned, when I have a letter from a mother in my district asking information as to how soon the body of her son will be returned and her son will be buried in her own cemetery, I want to answer that letter, and I want enough clerks in the Quartermaster's Department so I can get the information at once without having to wait. If there is one question that this Congress has before it that ought not to be brought into the range of economy it is the question of the expenditure of money for the return of the boys whose bodies lie in France. [Applause.] I do not want extravagance, but I want sufficient clerks in the office attending to this correspondence to get up the necessary documents and enable these bodies to be returned as soon as possible. I want to register my protest against the statement of the gentleman from Indiana that there is an effort on the part of the officers of the Army in the Quartermaster's Department to pad the pay rolls and keep useless men and women at work in order to magnify their position on a sacred subject. [Applause.]

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON] is to increase the amount of \$100,000 to \$500,000 of the third proviso, appearing on page 53:

Provided further, That there may be expended from and after the approval of this act and until June 30, 1921, from this appropriation and the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1920, a total amount not exceeding \$100,000 for personal services in the Cemeterial Division, Office of the Quartermaster, War Department—and so forth, and relating to the disposition abroad and the return to and the disposition in this country of the bodies of the



American boys who lost their lives in the World War. If the increase from \$100,000 to \$500,000 is necessary for the return of the bodies of our dead, the amendment should be adopted without objection, and the only question to determine is whether or not such increase is necessary. I believe it to be absolutely so, and without it there will be serious and long-continued delay.

I can hardly understand the declaration of men that they are in favor of bringing back the boys from France and other foreign lands to their homeland and at the same time opposing an essential and necessary allotment of money for that purpose. The propaganda referred to by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], which prompted the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, does not come from the direction indicated by him, but from the wives, the mothers, fathers, and close relatives of our boys buried in foreign lands. I venture the statement that most, if not all, Members of Congress have received letters of this character. I know of my personal knowledge that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON], who offers this amendment, has for many months been most active in urging that adequate provision be made by appropriation for the return of our soldier dead, whose relatives desire their return, and for the segregation in cemeteries in France of the bodies of those whose relatives desire that they remain abroad, and that he is prompted to-day by the single purpose that this great work, which rests upon this Government as a solemn obligation, be accomplished without delay. The statement has been made during the argument upon this amendment by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] that the amendment should be defeated, because it is unnecessary to increase the amount from \$100,000 to \$500,000 to carry on the work of the Cemeterial Division, and I feel sure that the claim of the gentleman from Indiana, as to the facts and as stated by him, is based upon erroneous information. During his discussion of the amendment, in order that the definite reason for his opposition might be developed and assigned, the following occurred:

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON] that it is my purpose to do everything in my power to help in bringing back the remains of these boys, which ought to have been brought back long ago; but I assume that the gentleman from Missouri will be opposed to the Quartermaster Corps or any other division of the Army taking advantage of this sacred subject for the purpose of keeping up their pay roll and adding to it after appropriation for such purpose has been denied them by other legislation.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. Upon what facts or evidence does the gentleman make that statement?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I make it on the basis of the evidence produced at the hearings that were had not only in the consideration of this bill, but before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having to do with the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Now, then, can you imagine, as a common-sense business man, the necessity for 416 additional clerks for the purpose of attending to the correspondence necessary and incident to the bringing back the remains of these soldier dead?

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further, I understand that the amount that is appropriated in the present bill, \$100,000, will cover the operations as the personnel is now constituted.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That has not anything to do with it. They have a personnel of 256 down there now that is provided for in other legislation.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. What bill?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The legislative, executive, and judicial bill appropriates \$3,000,000 for additional clerk hire in the War Department. Out of this sum ample provision can be made for all the clerks necessary to do this work, in my opinion, without the authorization of a single additional dollar, but we are allowing them \$100,000 more by this measure. Certainly with this increase they can get along if they so desire.

Mr. HUPSPETH. What is the reason for providing in this bill \$100,000 additional for these clerks that had already been taken care of in another bill.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I am free to say to the gentleman that I was opposed to authorizing a dollar additional; but in obedience to the majority rule the committee thought it was better that we give them an additional \$100,000, so that they might not have even an excuse. With the appropriations that have been authorized they can employ 80 additional clerks, which will be more than sufficient. Let us save as much of this money as we can for the purpose of bringing back our soldier dead and waste as little as possible of it in useless clerk hire.

Let the facts speak for themselves and they provide a sufficient and conclusive answer. The committee, in its report on the present bill, page 4, states:

It is estimated by the War Department that approximately 50,000 bodies will be returned to the United States at an average cost of \$500, and that approximately 25,000 bodies will be segregated in permanent American cemeteries in France at an average cost of \$200, making a total approximated cost for both purposes of \$30,000,000. There has been previously appropriated for this purpose approximately \$8,500,000 which is continued available for the next year by this bill and an additional appropriation of \$21,500,000 is recommended, thus placing at the disposal of the War Department the entire estimated cost for this purpose.

And I may say, in this connection, in the estimate of the War Department of \$30,000,000 there was included the expenses of the cemeterial division at the sum of \$500,000. The Secretary of War, in his letter to Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, states: "The

expenses of the cemeterial division were included in the estimate for \$21,549,000, submitted in connection with the appropriation for the 'disposition of remains,' and so forth, of our soldier dead, and were not and have not been included in the estimates for the operation of the office of the Quartermaster General of the Army or any other War Department activity." Therefore, if the amendment is not carried, the cemeterial division will be without funds to prosecute the work, and to make wise and effective expenditure of the appropriation provided by this bill. The letter by the Secretary of War to Mr. BYRNS is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, April 30, 1920.

HON. JOSEPH W. BYRNS,

House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BYRNS: Referring to your inquiry concerning the estimated sum required from the estimate for an appropriation of \$21,549,000 for the disposition of remains, for the payment of civilian personnel in the District of Columbia engaged to compile, record, prepare, and transmit data to the field force in Europe, upon which to base their operations for the return of the bodies of American soldier dead, you are advised that the present pay roll amounts to \$32,384.32 per month. In view of the provision in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill, which the amendment requested is desired to offset, the authorization for clerical hire, to be paid from the total estimated, as stated above, under the appropriation, "disposition of remains," should cover the three months of the current fiscal year and the entire fiscal year of 1921. This would make a total of 15 months, with a possible expenditure of \$485,764.80. The inclusion of the three months of the current fiscal year is in order to provide against any question the auditor might raise as to the provision in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill applying to disbursements prior to June 30, 1920.

If, therefore, the Committee on Appropriations should feel it their duty to limit the amount of money to be expended for clerical hire in the District of Columbia for this purpose, it might be placed at not to exceed \$500,000. It should, however, be clearly understood by the committee that this is not a request for additional funds, but a request that suitable authority be granted by legislative enactment to permit the use of funds in the District of Columbia—funds that have already been appropriated or are about to be appropriated for the disposition of the remains of our soldier dead and care of their foreign burial places, the use of which funds in the District of Columbia will be expressly forbidden in the legislative, executive, and judicial act.

It is deemed absolutely essential to the efficient prosecution of this work that the organization of the cemeterial division of the office of the Quartermaster General be not disturbed or broken up because of failure to grant suitable authority for its maintenance. The expenses of the cemeterial division were included in the estimate for \$21,549,000 submitted in connection with the appropriation for the "disposition of remains," etc., of our soldier dead and were not and have not been included in the estimates for the operation of the office of the Quartermaster General of the Army or any other War Department activity. If authority is not obtained for the continuance of the cemeterial division in the office of the Quartermaster General, it will become necessary to transfer this organization to some other city, with a view to avoiding the prohibition against the pay of its clerical force in the District of Columbia. This will mean a serious delay in the work of our field forces abroad, the loss of a very considerable number of the trained clerks now engaged in this work, the expenses of the move, and the additional and unnecessary rental of office space, and which office space is available in the office of the Quartermaster General. All the foregoing would be an additional and unnecessary expense to the taxpayers.

It should also be borne in mind that the prosecution of the work in Europe is absolutely dependent upon the supply of data from the records here in the United States, and that any delay in the supply of such data will increase the total cost of the work through idle time on the part of the working forces abroad or through inability to proceed with the work in accordance with plans made for its early completion.

It should also be borne in mind that the relatives in this country who desire the return of their dead are very insistent that this object be accomplished with the least possible delay, and will undoubtedly become clamorous should any delay occur through the lack of sufficient appropriation to prosecute the work. They are already very impatient at the delay caused by the unavoidable obstacles of distance, lack of transportation, and difficulty in securing and forwarding caskets and other supplies.

Very truly, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,  
Secretary of War.

It would seem—and most reasonably and justly so—that the letter of the Secretary of War is sufficient answer to the contention made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD]; but when the further facts bearing upon this question are considered, they show conclusively that the gentleman from Indiana is mistaken in his statement. He has stated that the legislative, executive, and judicial bill provides \$3,000,000 for additional clerk hire in the War Department, and "out of this some ample provision can be made for all the clerks necessary to do this work." The legislative bill referred to by the gentleman is H. R. 12610, introduced April 5, 1920, passed by the House and Senate, which appropriated \$3,000,000 for the entire War Department, and the same bill, in the proviso, at the top of page 79, declared:

Provided further, That \$1,850,000 of the foregoing sum shall be allotted to the office of The Adjutant General, and such portion thereof as may not be needed in that office shall not be allotted to any other office, but shall lapse and be covered into the Treasury.

It will not be contended, therefore, that any portion of the \$1,850,000 could be used by the cemeterial division, and after

deducting that sum from the total appropriation \$1,150,000 would be left for the use of the entire War Department, and of the remainder \$1,150,000 tentative allotment has been made by the Secretary of War, I learned by investigation, as follows:

Four hundred and seven thousand five hundred dollars to the Quartermaster General's office, of which one of the activities is the cemeterial branch.

Two hundred and seventeen thousand dollars to the Director of Finance.

One hundred and sixteen thousand five hundred dollars to the office of the Chief of Ordnance.

Seventy thousand dollars to the Surgeon General's office.

And the remaining \$338,300 has been tentatively allotted to the office of the Secretary of War, to the office of the Chief of Staff—including Military Information Division—to the office of the Director of Purchase, Storage and Traffic, to the Inspector General's office, to the office of the Judge Advocate General, to the office of the Chief Signal Officer, to the office of the Chief of Engineers, to the Militia Bureau, to the office of the Chief of Coast Artillery, to the Chemical Warfare Service, to the Motor Transport Corps, to the office of the Director of Real Estate Service, and to the office of the Director of the Transportation Service, thus exhausting the entire amount of the appropriation. In this connection I may say that the allotment of \$407,500 to the Quartermaster General's office—which is the maximum allotment, and reduction thereof may be necessitated by the imperative demands of other departments—has compelled and will immediately compel the discharge of 1,010 clerks in the Quartermaster General's office, and further reduction may interfere seriously, in fact most seriously, with the functioning of the department. I may further say that the cemeterial division, in the District of Columbia, of the Quartermaster General's office, which includes the administration branch thereof, and the graves registration service, will be unable to receive a dollar of the \$407,500, not only for the reasons assigned in the letter of the Secretary of War to Mr. BYRNS, growing out of the legislative limitations, but because the total amount of \$1,150,000 did not provide sufficient funds. Certainly it could not be taken out of the \$407,500 allotted to the Quartermaster General for his entire department, as his department includes the general administrative division, general service division, cemeterial division, personnel division, remount service, purchase service, surplus property division, storage service, and with many subdivisions having direct charge of different activities. The cemeterial division has never received a dollar from the Quartermaster General's office, and the expenses heretofore of the cemeterial division were included in the estimate of \$8,500,000 heretofore appropriated, and referred to in the report of the Committee on Appropriations, report No. 905.

The Secretary of War, in his letter of April 30, states that in his estimate of \$485,764.80 he has included three months of the current fiscal year—

in order to provide against any question the auditor might raise as to the provision in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill applying to disbursements prior to June 30, 1920.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] is again mistaken when he states that the increase contemplated in the amendment offered is for the purpose of increasing the number of clerks in the cemeterial division, either by the number of 80 or to the force of 416, as he seemed to think. The present monthly pay roll of the cemeterial division is \$32,384.32, and if that sum is multiplied by the 15 months included in the estimate by the War Department it will be found that it results in the exact sum of \$485,764.80, as set forth by the Secretary of War, and the Secretary, in order to provide a safe margin to care for contingencies and increased demands upon the cemeterial division, suggests that a total amount not exceeding \$500,000 be authorized for personal services in the division. Or, in other words, that the use of that sum for the purpose indicated be permitted out of the total appropriation of \$30,000,000.

Impartial investigation will show conclusively that, as now organized and if the work is to be conducted efficiently, expeditiously, and accurately, the sum of \$100,000 provided in the present bill under consideration will supply sufficient funds only for the period of three months, and that the failure to increase the amount to the sum of \$500,000 as provided in the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Dickinson] will mean serious and disastrous delay in the work of segregating the American dead in cemeteries in France and in returning to this country the remains of the 52,000, as has been determined by the relatives.

The necessity for the adoption of the amendment is further disclosed and emphasized by a communication, under date May

7, 1920, from the Secretary of War to the gentleman from Missouri presenting the amendment, Mr. DICKINSON. It is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, May 7, 1920.

Hon. C. C. DICKINSON,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. DICKINSON: I am in receipt of your letter of the 3d instant and desire to express my hearty appreciation of the interest taken by yourself and Mr. BYRNS in securing an amendment to the appropriation "Disposition of remains," etc., in the sundry civil bill, authorizing the payment of the necessary clerical force to properly conduct the graves registration service work in the District of Columbia. As you well understand, the maintenance of this force is essential in the compilation of data which must be furnished the overseas organization before they can proceed with their duties of disinterring and shipping the remains of our soldier dead to their homes in the United States.

It is unfortunate that the House Appropriations Committee determined to limit the amount to be expended to \$100,000. The pay roll for the authorized strength of the cemeterial division in the Quartermaster General's office now amounts to \$32,384.32 per month. It was estimated that any limitation placed upon the amount to be expended for clerical hire should include the last quarter of the current fiscal year for the reason that the question has arisen as to whether it immediately passed the provision of the legislative, executive, and judicial bill prohibiting payment of clerical employees from the appropriation "Disposition of remains," etc., might affect this period. The total sum, therefore, estimated as a charge against the appropriation "Disposition of remains," etc., would be the pay roll for 15 months, amounting to \$485,764.80. The committee was asked, if a limitation was deemed necessary, to pass it at \$500,000, in order to leave a margin of safety for possible emergency, not with the intention, however, of necessarily expending this sum for clerical hire.

The provision for clerical hire for the cemeterial division, as it now reads, considered in connection with the provision relating to pay of temporary employees in the District of Columbia, and that of No. 3679 Revised Statutes, as amended by acts of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat., 1257), and February 27, 1906 (34 Stat., 49), will, it is considered, absolutely limit the sum that can be expended for said clerical hire to \$100,000 from and after the date that pending sundry civil bill becomes a law to the end of the fiscal year 1921. This would be \$100,000 for about 13½ months, or \$7,407.40 per month, a reduction of \$24,976.92, or approximately 75 per cent per month. The effect of so drastic a reduction in an essential feature of this activity at this time certainly needs no argument to be understood.

I sincerely trust that the limit will be increased if not by amendment on the floor of the House, then by the Senate Appropriations Committee, as it would greatly retard the work and in the end increase the expense of the project should it become necessary to remove the clerical force employed in this work out of the District of Columbia.

Again thanking you for your interest in this matter and for the important assistance you have rendered, I am,

Very sincerely, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,  
Secretary of War.

The letter refers to the legislative limitation which I have mentioned as limiting the sum to be expended in the cemeterial division for clerk hire to \$100,000, and discloses in no uncertain terms the serious result which will be brought about, and delay the carrying on of the work of returning our soldier dead. The section of the statute referred to by the Secretary reads as follows:

For contingent expenses; how apportioned: All appropriations made for contingent expenses or other general purposes, except appropriations made in fulfillment of contract obligations expressly authorized by law, or for objects authorized or required by law, without reference to the amounts annually appropriated therefor, shall, on or before the beginning of each fiscal year, be so apportioned by monthly or other allotments as to prevent expenditures in one portion of the year which may necessitate deficiency or additional appropriations to complete the service of the fiscal year for which said appropriations are made; and all such apportionments shall be adhered to and shall not be waived or modified except upon the happening of some extraordinary emergency or unusual circumstance which could not be anticipated at the time of making such apportionment, but this provision shall not apply to the contingent appropriations of the Senate or House of Representatives, and in case said apportionments are waived or modified as herein provided the same shall be waived or modified in writing by the head of such executive department or other Government establishment having control of the expenditure, and the reason therefor shall be fully set forth in each particular case and communicated to Congress in connection with estimates for any additional appropriations required on account thereof. Any person violating any provision of the section shall be summarily removed from office and may also be punished by a fine of not less than \$100 or by imprisonment for not less than a month. (Sec. 3679, R. S., as amended by acts of Mar. 3, 1905 (33 Stat., 1257), and Feb. 27, 1906 (34 Stat., 49).)

The proposed sum of \$100,000, and as provided by the bill unless the amendment is adopted, is grossly inadequate and insufficient. It is not a time to match dollars or indulge a false idea of economy, in fulfilling and discharging the solemn obligation resting upon Congress—yes, upon the entire Nation—to return to the wives and the mothers and fathers the bodies of their dear ones, of those who so freely and heroically gave their lives.

The work of the cemeterial division is now progressing rapidly, efficiently, and, when the immense task before it is considered, economically.

As supplying some of the information and detail of the work which is now being accomplished, I desire to direct attention



to a letter just received by me from the office of the Quartermaster General of the Army, and which is as follows:

Hon. WM. T. BLAND,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BLAND: Referring to your telephonic conversation with Col. Jones of our cemeterial division late Saturday afternoon.

The work of this division is progressing in a really very gratifying manner. Considering a total of 75,490 bodies to be cared for the final data on 12,855 has been completed and is ready for dispatch overseas, 8,563 has actually been dispatched, and some 26,887 are in the process of preparation.

When we stop to consider that 51,773 bodies are in the so-called zone of the armies, it will be seen that not only have we completed Great Britain and some of the other smaller countries but we are well on the way toward the completion of the zone of the interior of France and are starting on the zone of the armies. To date we have sent out some 10,392 requests to the nearest relatives for final confirmation of the shipping instructions.

The following bodies have been returned to the United States:

|                            |     |
|----------------------------|-----|
| March                      | 18  |
| April                      | 440 |
| Waiting transport April 30 | 650 |

The return of bodies has been almost entirely dependent on the supply to our field forces overseas of caskets. To date the following caskets have been shipped overseas:

|          |       |
|----------|-------|
| December | 200   |
| February | 773   |
| March    | 1,532 |
| April    | 3,366 |

It is thought that the above data is sufficient to illustrate the progress that is being made in this most important work. We are just about getting into our stride. The strike recently of the railroad employees has seriously delayed, first, the delivery of completed caskets, and, secondly, and what is most important, the delivery of raw materials to the casket manufacturers. As a result, there have been delays, but which can not be attributed to this division or its field forces. We asked for the following deliveries of caskets:

|                       |       |
|-----------------------|-------|
| March                 | 3,000 |
| April                 | 4,500 |
| May                   | 4,625 |
| June                  | 5,000 |
| July                  | 6,000 |
| August                | 7,000 |
| Each month thereafter | 7,500 |

The situation at present, as refers to caskets, is somewhat as follows, probable deliveries:

|                       |       |
|-----------------------|-------|
| May and June, each    | 2,500 |
| July                  | 3,500 |
| Thereafter, per month | 5,000 |

Very truly, yours,

CHARLES C. PIERCE,  
Colonel, United States Army, Chief Cemeterial Division.  
By E. E. DAVIS,  
Executive Assistant.

As the work of the cemeterial division is now thoroughly organized and under good headway, it would be disastrous indeed if the realization of the hopes of those who are anxiously and impatiently waiting for the return of their dead should be disappointed or blasted. It is unspeakable, it is unthinkable, and unbelievable that such a result should be brought about by a failure of Congress to make adequate appropriation.

The casualties numbered approximately 79,000, of which 75,490 have been accurately identified. There are in addition about 900 graves in which the remains have not yet been identified and concerning which careful investigation is being made. Of the remainder of the casualties the remains or the graves have not been located, and concerning these every source of information is being exhausted. When it is remembered that in the national cemeteries, 82 of which are in the United States and 1 in Mexico, the remains equaling 44 per cent have been unidentified, the work of the cemeterial division here and overseas is remarkable. Many of our boys fell in the dark forests of the Argonne and in the forests along the Meuse, in the battle fields extending hundreds of miles, beneath the awful din of explosives, in the craters of shell holes, and were buried beneath an avalanche of debris, midst the haste and struggle of battle, sometimes intermingled or brigaded with foreign troops, and the fact that the records of identification have been completed to the extent already obtained is evidence of the important and vitally necessary work which is being done by the cemeterial division.

The complex and intricate character of the work of segregating and identifying the American dead to remain in France and returning the dead to this country imposes a serious responsibility, demanding thoroughness and accuracy; none must be lost or identity remain unascertained where human effort can avoid it. Sometimes the work relative to the identity of even one body imposes weeks and weeks and months of inquiry and investigation. Thousands and tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of letters of investigation and relating to other matters must be written and inquiries answered, and while mistakes must occur, they must be avoided if humanly possible. The personnel of the cemeterial division must not be crippled; skilled and experienced employees must be retained, and the

organization of the division must continue, but can not do so unless funds are provided.

The sum of \$100,000 proposed in the bill is, under the facts, as they actually exist, patently insufficient. The \$500,000 provided in the amendment offered will safeguard and continue the work of the division, and I feel as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] expressed himself, that I would prefer to appropriate too much rather than to appropriate less than is needed and thus refuse a sufficient amount. The sentiment which demands the return of the dead is one that can not be denied. I realize that considerable propaganda has been sent abroad to induce consent that the dead be left to rest in the land in which they died, but no propaganda, no logic, if it existed, no cold reasoning, if it could be made, can answer the demand of the mothers, the wives, the fathers, that their dead be returned to them; and if, by so doing, we can indulge their sentiment, if we can lessen their grief, assuage their sorrow, and can permit their loved ones to rest near them, it is our duty and our solemn obligation so to do.

Opposition has arisen here under the claim of economy, under the claim that it will afford employment to clerks. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has declared that an appropriation of \$3,000,000 was made to the War Department, and that it was at least a million too much, but when the real facts are considered, as I have frankly and fairly attempted to outline them, his position is wholly untenable.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] has objected to the amendment because he claims that we are appropriating money that is earned by sweat and toil, and paid by the taxpayer, and I venture the assertion that there is not a taxpayer, with a soul and a heart, and who possesses gratitude and patriotism, who would object to this amendment, if conversant with the facts as they actually exist.

I do not believe and can not believe that the majority party will prevent the passage of this amendment. The men who support this amendment have never given a thought to the question of supplying some one with a job, except to the extent that that some one may be necessary to accomplish the purposes for which the \$30,000,000 has been appropriated—return their dead to the sorrowing ones, to whom we must discharge our solemn obligation. I hope the chairman of the Appropriations Committee will withdraw his opposition to the amendment.

When the head of a great department assumes the responsibility and writes a letter, as did the Secretary of War to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], a member of the Appropriations Committee, and a former chairman thereof, and over his signature makes the statement, a serious and solemn statement, because it relates to a serious and solemn matter, I am not willing to discount that statement upon the mere declaration of any man on the floor of this House that sufficient appropriation has heretofore been made.

The truth of the matter is that the statement of the Secretary of War is fully and absolutely supported by the facts, and to deny his request and to refuse to supply sufficient funds, as will be provided by the amendment offered, is to deny to the mothers, wives, and fathers, and other close relatives, the right, when they have so elected, to have return made of the bodies of their loved ones, and at the earliest possible, practicable moment. The work should be carried on without delay. It has been delayed to an extent by the inability to secure caskets in sufficient number. The Secretary of War has declared that if necessary he would requisition ships for transport purposes.

The work of supplying final data, as has been disclosed, has been completed in South England, North England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and some of the smaller countries, and the work is nearly completed for the zone of interior France and is now being carried on for the zone of the armies.

To defeat the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri means delay that can well be, and should be, avoided, and is the assumption of a responsibility which no man should be willing to shoulder in the face of the insistence and the prayers of those who are demanding the return of their dead.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to talk any longer. I regret that my friend and colleague from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] should have made any personal reference. It was not a pleasant matter for me. After keeping posted on the data before the Committee on Appropriations and the final action of the committee, I concluded to move this amendment. I have not the same feeling toward public officials that my friend from Indiana has. I have felt that there should not have been so much delay and that this Government should earlier have made a more positive demand upon French authorities, and should have reached an agreement earlier. I



thought there would not be any obstacle in this House, where the representatives of the people are, and that when the agreement had been reached between the foreign Government of France and the Secretary of State and the War Department, then I regarded it as a settled matter. The estimate is made and it has been agreed to by the War Department and accepted by the Appropriations Committee, and they make an additional estimate in which they state that a certain portion of this is necessary for the work to be done here by the personnel in the district, and that ought to have been accepted—not one dollar more of added appropriation, but as you have limited it, you allow only \$1 out of \$300 of the estimated cost, while \$1 out of \$60 will be needed for this necessary work in Washington.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The gentleman says that there is not an appropriation of a single dollar more if we allow his amendment, but it takes away from the appropriation of \$21,000,000 just that much money intended to bring these bodies back.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. But we will save it all out of the work to be done here, to carry it on. You can save the entire \$30,000,000 for all purposes relating to the care of their graves and the return of those to be brought back by throwing a monkey wrench into it and saying that we appropriate the money in this bill, but will not permit its use, and will not give this force here, this necessary and directing force, opportunity to direct them in every detail, so that mistakes may not be made, and furnish all necessary data. This is necessary to be done. You seek to cripple the head of the work—the directing agency.

You rely upon the War Department for its full estimate, and then you criticize them. I do not believe that those men are less honest or less sincere than the representatives of the people here. The wrong about to be done is to be done by this body, if there is any wrong about to be done. They say that this work can not be carried on unless you permit them to use enough of it in order to communicate with all sections of the world where these bodies are, and give their directions. They have given you the estimates. If you fail to increase this as I have asked, then you have delayed it, I fear, for another fiscal year. [Applause.]

Or possibly if you fail to permit this necessary amendment, it may be taken and understood by the War Department as an instruction by Congress not to carry out the positive and solemn agreement made to the relatives of the soldier dead buried in France, or to further delay the bringing them back to this country. There should be no partisanship in this matter, nor unjust criticism. It is too sacred a matter to invite or cause partisan discussion or party differences. I desire to impugn no man's motive, but I hope you may lay aside your prejudices and permit this work to be done. In further explanation of this important matter I desire to insert here under the leave given me a letter from the Secretary of War of May 7, and inclosed extracts from acts referred to in said letter, all relative to this matter.

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, May 7, 1920.

Hon. C. C. DICKINSON,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. DICKINSON: I am in receipt of your letter of the 3d instant and desire to express my hearty appreciation of the interest taken by yourself and Mr. BYRNES in securing an amendment to the appropriation, "Disposition of remains," etc., in the sundry civil bill authorizing the payment of the necessary clerical force to properly conduct the graves registration service work in the District of Columbia. As you well understand, the maintenance of this force is essential in the compilation of data which must be furnished the overseas organization before they can proceed with their duties of disintering and shipping the remains of our soldier dead to their homes in the United States.

It is unfortunate that the House Appropriation Committee determined to limit the amount to be expended to \$100,000. The pay roll for the authorized strength of the cemeterial division in the Quartermaster General's office now amounts to \$32,384.32 per month. It was estimated that any limitation placed upon the amount to be expended for clerical hire should include the last quarter of the current fiscal year for the reason that the question has arisen as to whether if immediately passed the provision of the legislative, executive, and judicial bill prohibiting payment of clerical employees from the appropriation, "Disposition of remains," etc., might affect this period. The total sum, therefore, estimated as a charge against the appropriation, "Disposition of remains," etc., would be the pay roll for 15 months amounting to \$485,764.80. The committee was asked, if a limitation was deemed necessary, to pass it at \$500,000 in order to leave a margin of safety for possible emergency, not with the intention, however, of necessarily expending this sum for clerical hire.

The provision for clerical hire for the cemeterial division, as it now reads, considered in connection with the provision relating to pay of temporary employees in the District of Columbia, and that of Revised Statutes 3679, as amended by acts of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat., 1257), and February 27, 1906 (34 Stat., 49), will, it is considered, absolutely limit the sum that can be expended for said clerical hire to \$100,000 from and after the date that the pending sundry civil bill becomes a law, to the end of the fiscal year 1921. This would be \$100,000 for about 13½ months, or \$7,407.40 per month, a reduction of \$24,976.92, or approximately 75 per cent per month. The effect of a drastic reduction in an essential feature of this activity at this time certainly needs no argument to be understood.

I sincerely trust that the limit will be increased, if not by amendment on the floor of the House, then by the Senate Appropriations Committee, as it would greatly retard the work, and in the end increase the expense of the project, should it become necessary to remove the clerical force employed in this work out of the District of Columbia.

Again thanking you for your interest in this matter and for the important assistance you have rendered, I am,

Very sincerely, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER.

[Extract from an act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes.]

Provided further, That appropriations contained in any other act for the fiscal year 1921 shall not be used for the payment of civilian personnel in the bureaus or offices of the War Department in the District of Columbia except such as may be authorized by this act or as may be appropriated for the Army War College and Office of the Chief of Staff in the Army appropriation act and the Board of Ordnance and Fortifications in the fortification appropriation act.

For contingent expenses; how apportioned: All appropriations made for contingent expenses or other general purposes, except appropriations made in fulfillment of contract obligations expressly authorized by law or for objects required or authorized by law without reference to the amounts annually appropriated therefor, shall, on or before the beginning of each fiscal year, be so apportioned by monthly or other allotments as to prevent expenditures in one portion of the year which may necessitate deficiency or additional appropriations to complete the service of the fiscal year for which said appropriations are made; and all such apportionments shall be adhered to and shall not be waived or modified except upon the happenings of some extraordinary emergency or unusual circumstance which could not be anticipated at the time of making such apportionment, but this provision shall not apply to the contingent appropriations of the Senate or House of Representatives, and in case said apportionments are waived or modified as herein provided the same shall be waived or modified in writing by the head of such executive department or other Government establishment having control of the expenditure, and the reasons therefor shall be fully set forth in each particular case and communicated to Congress in connection with estimates for any additional appropriations required on account thereof. Any person violating any provisions of the section shall be summarily removed from office and may also be punished by a fine of not less than \$100 or by imprisonment for not less than one month. Sec. 3679, R. S., as amended by acts of Mar. 3, 1905 (33 Stat., 1257), and Feb. 27, 1906 (34 Stat., 49).

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with anyone who lost a loved one in the late war. I can well understand the desire of those who have near and dear ones buried in France to have the remains brought back to the land of their birth that they may rest under the banner for which they fought and died, but we must not be actuated in matters of this sort by the dictates of our hearts alone, because we must not lose sight of the fact that, after all, it is the people's money that we are appropriating, money that is being wrung out of the taxpayers by every conceivable means, money that is earned by sweat and toil. It is my understanding that no hearings were held upon this particular feature of the bill by the Committee on Appropriations, and, therefore, if we are to legislate at this time upon this matter we must do so blindly and be guided altogether by sentiment rather than by cold facts. There is not a man on the floor of this House who would refuse to give every dollar necessary to carry on the work which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON] has in mind.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Is my friend from Minnesota prepared to state to the House that the appropriation out of this \$31,000,000 asked for by the gentleman from Missouri is not necessary? Is the gentleman prepared to state that it is not necessary to carry on the work of bringing those bodies back home?

Mr. KNUTSON. I will ask the gentleman a question. Is he prepared to state that it is necessary?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I am not on the witness stand.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does the gentleman not think, in respect to a matter of this sort, if there is any doubt, the doubt ought to be resolved in favor of the appropriation? Can he bring himself, alluding to his observation a moment ago, to decide such a matter "upon the cold facts"?

Mr. KNUTSON. Is the gentleman in favor of spending money lavishly when he does not know that such money is actually needed? Has not the time come for this Congress to legislate on facts rather than on sentiment?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I have sat here and witnessed the most lavish appropriations for all sorts of things, and when a grief-stricken father stands before us, after having made all of the investigation that he finds possible, and pleads for this money to provide for the return of the bodies of the soldiers, I, for one, propose to heed his plea and vote for the appropriation. [Applause.]

Mr. KNUTSON. I will say to the gentleman that there is absolutely nothing to show that this money is necessary.



Mr. HUDSPETH. There is the estimate of the Secretary of War.

Mr. KNUTSON. The figures of the Committee on Appropriations show that a sufficient appropriation has been made to carry this work on, and if you gentlemen feel that you can spend this money which belongs to the taxpayers of the country when it has not been proven that it is necessary, of course the responsibility must be yours.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The Secretary of War made his estimate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is recognized for five minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be no limit to the length that some people will go in their endeavor to preserve the jobs of certain superfluous and unnecessary employees of the Federal Government. [Applause.] We have now reached a point when the sacred name of our heroic dead is being invoked for the purpose of holding swivel-chair artists in their jobs. We gave the War Department \$3,000,000 for temporary clerks. It is at least a million dollars too much [applause], at least a million dollars more than is necessary, and yet it is the best that we can do in the face of the everlastingly continuous insistence of the administration that these superfluous employees shall be retained. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON], by reason of his own very great loss, with which we all sympathize, is naturally susceptible to the claims of those who are endeavoring to keep the public pay rolls padded in the name of a sacred and patriotic purpose—

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. If the gentleman will permit me just a moment—

Mr. MONDELL. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. I do not think the gentleman ought to make that statement. Nobody asked me to introduce anything of this kind and I am not influenced. My name ought not to be brought into this, and please keep my name out of it.

Mr. MONDELL. We sympathize with the gentleman's interest in all this sort of thing and we sympathize with his very great loss, but I do not think that the American people would be very much pleased if they heard that we had taken from the appropriations for the return of our heroic dead, intended and purposed to bring about the return of their bodies, a half million dollars to give to clerks in large, comfortable, well-ventilated offices here in Washington, working seven hours a day in a very leisurely way beneath fans in constant motion to keep the temperature just what it ought to be for those people during the period of their service.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will yield.

Mr. BLACK. Speaking of the seven-hour-a-day period, I recall that the gentleman led the fight to preserve that, and I saw one of the most beautiful bouquets I ever saw in the lobby of the House presented to the gentleman from Wyoming by Government clerks. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know that that has anything to do with the question now before us. The fact remains that gentlemen are proposing to take from the appropriation made for the purpose of bringing back the remains of the soldier boys an additional \$400,000 to furnish jobs here in Washington for clerks who are not needed. No one who is at all familiar with this fact, who has investigated carefully—

Mr. CALDWELL rose.

Mr. MONDELL. I have not the time to yield—can believe that any such number of clerks are needed for this service. It is just another attempt, and a reprehensible attempt, in the name of a great obligation on the part of the American people, to keep superfluous clerks attached to the public pay roll. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-two gentlemen are present, not a quorum, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

|              |                |               |           |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|-----------|
| Andrews, Md. | Butler         | Crowther      | Doremus   |
| Ayes         | Cantrill       | Cullen        | Drane     |
| Bacharach    | Caraway        | Curry, Calif. | Dupré     |
| Bankhead     | Carew          | Davey         | Dyer      |
| Benson       | Casey          | Davis, Tenn.  | Echols    |
| Blackmon     | Christopherson | Dempsey       | Edmonds   |
| Bland, Ind.  | Clark, Fla.    | Denison       | Ellsworth |
| Bowers       | Cleary         | Dent          | Elston    |
| Brinson      | Cooper         | Dewalt        | Emerson   |
| Brumbaugh    | Costello       | Donovan       | Esch      |
| Burke        | Cramton        | Dooling       | Ferris    |

|                  |                |                 |                 |
|------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Fields           | Juul           | Morin           | Siegel          |
| Fordney          | Kelley, Mich.  | Nicholls        | Sisson          |
| Gard             | Kelly, Pa.     | Nolan           | Slemp           |
| Garland          | Kendall        | O'Connell       | Small           |
| Goldfogle        | Kennedy, Iowa  | Olney           | Smith, Ill.     |
| Goodykoontz      | Kennedy, R. I. | Pell            | Smith, N. Y.    |
| Gould            | Kettner        | Peters          | Snell           |
| Graham, Pa.      | Kless          | Porter          | Snyder          |
| Greene, Vt.      | Kitchin        | Radcliffe       | Steagall        |
| Griest           | Kreider        | Rafney, Ala.    | Steele          |
| Hamill           | Langley        | Ramsey          | Stephens, Miss. |
| Hamilton         | Lankford       | Rayburn         | Stephens, Ohio  |
| Harrison         | Lazaro         | Reavis          | Stiness         |
| Hastings         | Lee, Ga.       | Reber           | Strong, Pa.     |
| Haugen           | Leshner        | Rhodes          | Sullivan        |
| Hayden           | Little         | Riordan         | Summers, Wash.  |
| Hays             | Loneragan      | Robinson, N. C. | Taylor, Tenn.   |
| Heflin           | Longworth      | Rodenberg       | Temple          |
| Hernandez        | Lufkin         | Rose            | Tillman         |
| Hersman          | McCulloch      | Rowan           | Tinkham         |
| Hill             | McFadden       | Rucker          | Upshaw          |
| Houghton         | McKenzie       | Sabath          | Vaile           |
| Howard           | McKinley       | Sanders, Ind.   | Vare            |
| Hulings          | Maher          | Sanders, La.    | Vestal          |
| Hutchinson       | Mann, S. C.    | Sanders, N. Y.  | Voigt           |
| Johnson, S. Dak. | Mansfield      | Scott           | Ward            |
| Johnson, Wash.   | Mason          | Scully          | Wheeler         |
| Johnston, N. Y.  | Mays           | Sears           | Williams        |
| Jones, Pa.       | Mead           | Sells           | Wilson, Pa.     |
| Jones, Tex.      | Merritt        | Shreve          | Yates           |

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ANDERSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 13870, the sundry civil appropriation bill, finding itself without a quorum, under the rule he caused the roll to be called, whereupon 259 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and he presented herewith the list of absentees to be entered upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its session.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate upon this section be extended for a further period of five minutes. Mr. Chairman, I do this because this is a very vital matter, one on which the Military Affairs Committee has had some information, and no member of the Committee on Military Affairs has spoken upon the subject, and the only speech that remains—

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa objects.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is not recognized for that purpose. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON].

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, it is always in order—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair stated the question. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. CALDWELL. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman demands a division.

Mr. CALDWELL. May we have the amendment reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be again reported.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 87, yeas 109.

Mr. CALDWELL. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. CALDWELL and Mr. GOOD took their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and there were—ayes 80, yeas 118.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Page 53, line 24, strike out the figures "\$100,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$400,000."

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that debate has been closed on the paragraph and amendments thereto by order of the committee. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON].

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent to speak on the amendment.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it does not need any unanimous consent for a man to speak for five minutes on an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The debate was closed on the paragraph and all amendments thereto by the order of the committee, by unanimous consent. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers a further amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Page 53, line 24, after the word "exceeding," strike out the figures "\$100,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$300,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 67, yeas 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment pending at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McKEOWN: Page 53, line 20, after the word "cemeteries," insert "and for paying storage costs and expenses for returning the effects of deceased soldiers and enlisted men."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that. Mr. McKEOWN. I do not think it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, yes; it is. The item in the bill provides for the bringing back of the remains and not bringing back the effects. It is not germane to the proposition.

Mr. McKEOWN. I will state to the gentleman that it does not increase the appropriation any, and it permits them to pay these expenses. These families and relatives of the deceased have to pay these storage charges that have accumulated over in Paris.

Mr. GOOD. That is the language asked for by the War Department.

Mr. McKEOWN. I do not care for that.

Mr. GOOD. And they have an appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. MADDEN. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. McKEOWN. The gentleman from Illinois asks for the regular order. I was presenting a point of order. The point of order is made that this is an appropriation to bring back the bodies of deceased officers and soldiers. That is true. But this provision in the amendment is to bring back the effects also, and I do not think the point of order is well taken.

Mr. GOOD. That is all provided for in the Army bill.

Mr. McKEOWN. They are not paying it. They are charging these people up with these expenses, and I have introduced a bill—

Mr. GOOD. If that is the case, there is no authority for it, and that clearly establishes the provision. The point I am making is that the gentleman's amendment would be subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The paragraph under consideration appears to provide for the preparation, return, and transportation of the bodies of service men who died abroad. There appears to be no provision in the paragraph which relates either to the storage of or expenses for returning the effects of the deceased officers and enlisted men. The Chair thinks the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma is not germane to the paragraph, and therefore sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Confederate Mound, Oakwood Cemetery, Chicago: For care, protection, and maintenance of the plot of ground known as "Confederate Mound" in Oakwood Cemetery, Chicago, \$500.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I asked, a few moments ago, unanimous consent in order that I might call the attention of the House to what the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON] really was. It seems that this body has just divided purely upon political grounds, when the question at issue—

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that the Chair does not think the gentleman has proceeded far enough to enable the Chair to judge of that.

Mr. CALDWELL. This issue is one away above the question of partisan politics. It is a question of humanity, just as the provision that has been read by the Clerk here is a question of humanity. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON], it so happened, lost a boy in battle in the great World War, and his remains now lie buried—

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to the paragraph under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is not speaking to the paragraph under consideration.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph under consideration has a clause in it, "For the care of the Oakwood Cemetery at Chicago," and it is expected that a number of bodies that are brought across from the other side will be buried in that cemetery, and I was trying to call the attention of the House to the fact that our honored colleague, who has served for many years in the Congress of the United States—

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to the motion—the motion to strike out the "\$500."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, it is, of course, not to be expected that men who would put through a gag resolution, such as was put through here a few minutes ago, would submit to the placing in the Record of a statement of just what had been done.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the gentleman is not speaking to his motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The gentleman from New York will take his seat.

Mr. CALDWELL. I moved to strike out the figures "\$500," and I desire to speak to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not speaking to it. A point of order has been made, and the Chair sustains the point of order, and the gentleman from New York will take his seat.

Mr. CALDWELL. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For care, protection, and maintenance of Confederate Stockade Cemetery, Johnstons Island, in Sandusky Bay, Ohio, \$350.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in line 13, page 54, the figures "\$350."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CALDWELL: Page 54, line 13, strike out the figures "\$350."

Mr. CALDWELL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have moved to strike out the figures "\$350," because a few moments ago, when I was acting as a teller in this House on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON], I noticed that there was not a single Republican in this House that voted for that amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to his motion.

Mr. CALDWELL. Now, I propose to give the Republicans the opportunity at this time to go a little bit further in the matter of partisanship and strike out the "\$350."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. CALDWELL. I am proceeding in order, and I propose now to give the Republicans a chance to strike out "\$350" for the care of another cemetery, when they a few minutes ago voted solidly, to a man, against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON]. There was but one Democrat who voted against that amendment, and I do not believe that this question of the care of soldier dead is one upon which this House should divide upon partisan lines. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is a scandal; it is an outrage; and it is a shame. Mr. Chairman, I move to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. CALDWELL. I have withdrawn the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. I object to the gentleman withdrawing it, because I want to discuss it.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment can not be withdrawn if there is objection. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Illinois.



Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York is trying to make it appear that the Republicans of the House voted against the care of some cemetery.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not in order. If a Democrat can not talk upon this issue, surely a Republican has no right to. They have no right to live, anyhow! [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will admonish the gentleman from Illinois to proceed in order.

Mr. MADDEN. I will do that. I am opposed to striking out the figures "\$350," proposed to be stricken out by the gentleman from New York, because I believe that the Confederate cemetery should be cared for, and the gentleman wants it stricken out because he thinks the cemetery ought not to be cared for.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not in order.

Mr. MADDEN. If the motion of the gentleman from Missouri had proposed to care for a cemetery, I would have been for his motion; but what did it provide for? It provided that \$500,000 should be expended out of the appropriation for the removal of remains of ex-service men who died in France and that the money be expended in order that they might be able to keep a lot of Democrats on the pay roll.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Illinois is not in order, and I demand that the official reporters do not take down what he is saying.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from New York does not want this cemetery cared for, because he has moved to strike out the appropriation for the care of it.

Mr. CALDWELL. I make the point of order that the gentleman from Illinois is not in order, and I demand that the Republican Chairman of this committee comply with the rules of this House and rule that the gentleman is not in order. It was only a little while ago that this House was treated to an exhibition of gag rule and partisanship, when the Republican Chairman ordered me to take my seat, and I demand that the Chair rule on the point of order I have made, that the gentleman from Illinois is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed in order.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes; but a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MADDEN. I propose to proceed in order.

Mr. CALDWELL. When I was ruled out of order the Chairman ordered me to take my seat. Now I demand that the Chair enforce the same rule against a Republican that he enforced against a Democrat.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. The Chair desires—

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON. When a gentleman is proceeding to yell out of order, and all that kind of thing, is it not the duty of the Chair to instruct the official reporters not to insert it in the Record?

Mr. CALDWELL. Ah—

Mr. CANNON. Oh, well, the gentleman says "Ah." I am making a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen will be in order, and the Chair will make a statement. The Chair permitted the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL] to proceed until it was clearly demonstrated that his remarks were not in order. Although the point of order was made that his remarks were not in order, the Chair permitted him to proceed, and admonished him to proceed in order, until it was clearly demonstrated that the gentleman's remarks were not in order, and the Chair was following exactly the same procedure in the case of the gentleman from Illinois. If the gentleman from Illinois transgresses the rule and proceeds out of order, the Chair will sustain the point of order and direct the gentleman from Illinois to take his seat. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed in order.

Mr. MADDEN. I was about to say, Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from New York interrupted me, that he seems to be very solicitous about saving \$350, which is about to be appropriated for the care of a cemetery in which some of the Confederate dead are buried, whereas he was not at all solicitous about an appropriation of \$500,000 for the purpose of keeping a lot of clerks on the pay roll, which was to be taken out of the money proposed to be used for the return of the soldier dead.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not in order, and I demand that the Chair rule on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Illinois is in order. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed in order.

Mr. MADDEN. I was only illustrating, Mr. Chairman. Now, on the contrary, I am in favor of appropriating this \$350 or any other sum necessary for the care of a cemetery, but at the same time I am in favor of saving \$500,000 or any other unnecessary sum, and my interest is in the public service and not in padding the Government pay roll with unnecessary employees in order that a few Democrats who are not needed may be able to retain their positions on the pay roll.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not in order.

Mr. MADDEN. That is all I desire to say, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. CALDWELL. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Monuments or tablets in Cuba and China: For repairs and preservation of monuments, tablets, roads, fences, etc., made and constructed by the United States in Cuba and China to mark the places where American soldiers fell, \$1,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the soldiers' bonus.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the soldiers' bonus. Is there objection?

Mr. CALDWELL. I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

Gettysburg National Military Park: For continuing the establishment of the park; acquisition of lands, surveys, and maps; constructing, improving, and maintaining avenues, roads, and bridges thereon; fences and gates; marking the lines of battle with tablets and guns, each tablet bearing a brief legend giving historic facts and compiled without censure and without praise; preserving the features of the battle field and the monuments thereon; compensation of civilian commissioner, clerical and other services, expenses, and labor; purchase and preparation of tablets and gun carriages and placing them in position; maintenance, repair, and operation of a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, and all other expenses incident to the foregoing, \$65,000.

Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of the item of \$65,000 carried in this bill for maintenance and improvements on the Gettysburg National Park, especially because it is in my district. Gettysburg is a sacred place in the hearts and memories of thousands of hoary veterans who wore the blue and the gray, and no battle field in the whole world is more widely known for its history, fine monuments, beautiful scenery, and good roads. It is a mecca for a hundred thousand tourists each year from every State and every land. Before our States took up the building of good roads Gettysburg had them. In 1895 the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania ceded to the United States 14 miles of road within the Gettysburg Park, but a gap three-fourths of a mile long in the Taneytown Road still remains unimproved. It is in the direct road leading to Round Top and Little Round Top, two important points of interest visited by all strangers, and for nine months of the year is practically impassable. Efforts have been made in previous Congresses to secure appropriation for this very much needed improvement, but each time in vain. I also presented the appeals of Col. J. P. Nicholson, chairman of Gettysburg National Park Commission, and citizens of Gettysburg, also the indorsement of the Secretary of War, to the Committee on Appropriations.

I would now like to ask the chairman of the committee whether any amount is included in this appropriation for that purpose?

Mr. GOOD. The appropriation is \$15,000 more than for the current year, and in granting that the committee took into consideration that it was necessary to macadamize this small stretch of road. It is ample for that purpose, and it is included in this appropriation.

The Clerk read as follows:

Shiloh National Military Park: For continuing the establishment of the park; compensation of civilian commissioner; secretary and superintendent; clerical and other services; labor; historical tablets; maps and surveys; roads; purchase and transportation of supplies, implements, and materials; foundations for monuments; office and other necessary expenses, including maintenance, repair, and operation of a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, \$25,435.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 56, lines 23 and 24, strike out the word "civilian commissioner," and on page 57, line 3, strike out the sum "\$25,435" and insert in lieu thereof the sum of "\$22,435."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, since this bill was acted upon by the committee the only civilian commissioner of this park has died, and therefore the words "civilian commissioner" should be eliminated and \$3,000 of the amount appropriated should be eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Nothing contained in the provision regarding the making and enforcing of regulations governing the speed of motor vehicles in the District of Columbia found in section 1 of the District of Columbia act approved March 3, 1917, shall be construed to interfere with the exclusive charge and control heretofore committed to the Chief of Engineers over the park system of the District of Columbia, and he is hereby authorized and empowered to make and enforce all regulations for the control of vehicles and traffic, and limiting the speed thereof on roads, highways, and bridges within the public grounds in the District of Columbia, under his control, subject to the penalties prescribed in the act entitled "An act regulating the speed of automobiles in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1906.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that in line 7, page 59, the spelling of the word "Columbia" may be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Executive Mansion: For ordinary care, repair, and refurnishing of Executive Mansion, and for purchase, maintenance, and driving of horses and vehicles for official purposes, to be expended by contract or otherwise, as the President may determine, \$45,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the amount of \$45,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 62, line 16, strike out "\$45,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I am one Democrat who believes that when it is proper to make a certain retrenchment in the affairs of our Government, controlled either by Democrats or Republicans, it is the duty of Congress to require that retrenchment.

I want to call attention to some of these extravagant items for our respective departments, Executive Mansion—the White House and grounds—that has been going on every year in this sundry civil bill without let or hindrance, without anyone saying yea or nay, but passing them on.

Let us compare the various items in this bill with the items passed in the last sundry civil bill, and you will then ascertain that all of these items are annual appropriations, paid out and expended each year:

*Passed in the last sundry civil bill for fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.*

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| Improvement of grounds, etc.                                      | \$5,000 |
| Employment of engineer  | 2,400   |
| Machinery, tools, etc.  | 1,000   |
| Care, repair mansion, etc.  | 40,000  |
| Fuel, mansion and greenhouses                                     | 8,000   |
| Care and maintenance of greenhouses                               | 9,000   |
| Repair to greenhouses   | 3,000   |
| Reconstructing one greenhouse                                     | 4,000   |
| Traveling expenses of President                                   | 25,000  |
| Lighting mansion, etc.  | 8,600   |
| Lighting grounds, watchmen lodges, offices, and greenhouses, etc. | 23,000  |
| Heating offices, watchmen lodges, and greenhouses, etc.           | 4,500   |

*Contained in present sundry civil bill for fiscal year ending June 30, 1921.*

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| Improvement of grounds, etc.                                      | \$5,000 |
| Employment of engineer  | 2,400   |
| Machinery, tools, etc.  | 1,000   |
| Care, repair mansion, etc.  | 45,000  |
| Fuel, mansion and greenhouses                                     | 8,000   |
| Care and maintenance of greenhouses                               | 9,000   |
| Repair to greenhouses   | 3,000   |
| Reconstructing one greenhouse                                     | 4,000   |
| Traveling expenses of President                                   | 25,000  |
| Lighting mansion, etc.  | 8,600   |
| Lighting grounds, watchmen lodges, offices, and greenhouses, etc. | 24,000  |
| Heating offices, watchmen lodges, greenhouses, etc.               | 6,500   |

Now, Mr. Chairman, is it necessary to spend all of the above each and every year? Is it necessary to spend \$4,000 every year for reconstructing one greenhouse? Is it absolutely necessary to spend from \$40,000 to \$45,000 each and every year for care and maintenance of this White House building alone? I say that it is ridiculous. None of this \$45,000 goes to pay the horde of servants, guards, and watchmen. They are all paid out of other appropriations. No citizen ever has his private residence painted and gone over every year, no matter how rich he is, or how much unneeded money he has to spend. Eight thousand dollars for fuel each year is ridiculous. Nine thousand dollars for care of greenhouses each year is ridiculous. Eight thousand six hundred dollars for lighting mansion each year is ridiculous. We ought to wake up and stop some of this

extravagance. It is our extravagance, after all, and we can not charge it up to anybody but Congress, and we are each and all of us guilty if we permit it to continue.

For drainage back of the iron fence at the north front of the Executive Mansion grounds \$1,500. That, however, was not in the last year's sundry civil bill, but to offset this item there was an appropriation in the last sundry civil bill of \$1,000 for a new roof on the storehouse in the White House propagating gardens. Committee after committee has been copying these same extravagant items of appropriation into the sundry civil bill for years and years and it ought to be stopped.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MONDELL. Does not the gentleman realize that in items of this sort relating to the Executive Mansion, the home of the President, the committee can not inquire quite so closely as it might in some other cases? It seems to me we must take the word of the persons in charge.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, it is not the present Democratic President who is asking for this money. He has no idea these items are in this bill. All of these items have been carried here each year in the sundry civil appropriation bill for each of your Republican Presidents, and the trouble of it all is that you do not stop to inquire into the necessity of the items, but because a Republican President occupied the White House you appropriated, and the money was spent, and you can not get out of the habit and can not stop these appropriations.

Mr. MONDELL. But they were never quite so large.

Mr. BLANTON. It is a custom and a usage that has been indulged in here by the committee year after year. I do not know but that the committee has too many other things to do on the outside and that they have not time to look into these items of public business.

Mr. MONDELL. But the sums were never quite so large as they have been lately.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, they have been just about the same size every single year, and if the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] will take time from his office on political matters to look into the other sundry civil bills, he will find that they are almost exactly in the same amount each year. I do not care whether the committee feels that it can not inquire into it or not, I am one Democrat who stands in this House and says that if these items are too large and are extravagantly unnecessary, even if there is a Democratic President in the White House, the people of America and the President, who know they have got to economize, do not want this extravagance kept up here in the city of Washington year after year.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. On the last item of these, what has the gentleman to say—I refer to the \$25,000 item for traveling expenses of the President, to be expended only upon his certificate?

Mr. BLANTON. I want to see that \$25,000 item cut out of this bill. That is too much annual money for traveling expenses.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman move that that be stricken out?

Mr. BLANTON. I will, if the gentleman will stand with me and help vote it out.

Mr. MILLER. I will stand right with the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. Our distinguished President does not have to spend any such sum for traveling.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. In view of the statement made by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], I think the gentleman from Texas should make the matter clear that there has been no increase in that item in recent years.

Mr. BLANTON. No; it has been carried here year after year, and the committee just blindly follows the old custom of putting these items back in the bill. I dare say there is not a person from the White House who has ever asked for one of these items. It is just keeping up this old Republican custom for the last 25 years. But the money is expended and goes each year.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. KING. Does not the gentleman realize that the high cost of living affects the White House and the surroundings the same as it does other people?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, we pay the President of the United States \$75,000, and that is some money for a democratic Republic to pay, and we make him every kind of a liberal allow-



ance for the necessities of the White House. I want to say to you that \$45,000 a year is too much money for the ordinary care and repair of the White House.

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman understand that there are 80 rooms in the Executive Mansion, and that this takes care of the rooms, the mechanical care of the building, and the furnishing of the buildings, the repainting, the redecorating of the rooms, and all that sort of thing?

Mr. BLANTON. I want the distinguished gentleman from Iowa to go back to his State and ask his people whether these thousands and thousands of dollars that have been carried in the sundry civil appropriation bill under this heading for years and years represent what they want to expend in a Republic for such items.

Mr. GOOD. I do not believe there is a man in my State who is opposed to that appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. BLANTON. I think we ought to practice economy from the President's White House down to our own homes, because we have got to do it if we ever get this Republic out of debt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the plea for economy on the part of the active member of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and I agree that there is need for economy; but I believe that the American people are interested in seeing to it that the Executive Mansion and the surrounding grounds are kept in the best of order. I think they are willing that sufficient money should be expended in order that the President and his family, both his private family and the official family, may live and have every necessary comfort and convenience. In the care that is bestowed upon this part of the District we have to contend with the increases in the cost of labor and material, the same as we do to other sections of the District.

I think the increases in these items because of that may have been very considerable, but I believe that the people who come to Washington want to see the Executive Mansion and grounds kept up in proper order and in splendid condition. Of course, they are interested in that. They are so interested in it, I will say, that at times they see to it that different people occupy that Executive Mansion, and I think their interest is so intense and sufficiently deep that at the next available opportunity they will see to it that there will be another occupant after the 4th of March of next year [applause on the Republican side], and I trust the gentleman will not seek to eliminate these appropriations so that in case there should be a different occupant at the expiration of the term of the present one we should have to bring in a deficiency in order to tidy up the place and keep it up to the standard that has heretofore been maintained during all these years.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I will.

Mr. KEARNS. The gentleman has spoken of the interior decorations of the White House—

Mr. WALSH. No; I did not speak about that.

Mr. KEARNS. It has been mentioned here on the floor of the House; I thought it was the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. No; I did not mention it.

Mr. KEARNS. I was just wondering and want to know, and I know a great many people in the United States are anxious to know, why it is more than three years since anyone has seen the inside of that part of the Executive Mansion that is not used by the President and his immediate family.

Mr. WALSH. Well, I do not know as to that. I think there are certain parts of the Executive Mansion that have been open from time to time—

Mr. KEARNS. Why, certainly, but not within three years.

Mr. BLANTON. Why, there were at least 100 Texas people who saw the interior last summer.

Mr. KEARNS. I want to ask the gentleman from Texas about that.

Mr. BLANTON. There were three months in which the White House was open, and every single constituent you sent down there with a card had the privilege of going in there.

Mr. KEARNS. When was that?

Mr. BLANTON. Three months, while the President was gone to France.

Mr. KEARNS. He was away eight months.

Mr. BLANTON. There were three months in Washington when you could send a constituent down there at any time.

Mr. KEARNS. What I want to know, and what I think the people want to know, is why the people of the United States were barred from it for two years and nine months. They own that building—

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, they own this building, but they are barred from here whenever you hold a Republican caucus here.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I will say that may be the very reason for the increase in the appropriation.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to say, if the gentleman will permit me to reply to the gentleman from Ohio, that up until the time of the illness of the President there was never a time when visitors were not admitted to the East Room of the White House. During the war they were restricted to a certain extent in going into the rooms of the White House on the first floor, not the East Room—

Mr. KEARNS. I want to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that it has not been open to all the constituency of the United States. I do not know about the people from Texas or the gentleman's district, but I do know that the people from other parts of the United States have been barred from the White House for three years, unless, possibly, the three months' interval mentioned by the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I ask that the gentleman have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman knows that immediately after the declaration of war every public building, practically, in the city of Washington was closed to visitors, and the White House was also closed during that period to visitors, and with that exception there has not been a time up until the illness of the President that the public were not freely admitted to the East Room and also to the rooms on the first floor of the White House upon the card of a Member of Congress.

Mr. KEARNS. When was that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It was before the war, as I have just stated.

Mr. KEARNS. Before the war?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. Of course, anybody could get in before the war.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman knows that the public were not admitted indiscriminately to the Treasury Department, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and other public buildings during the war.

During other periods admission to the White House was as freely extended under this administration as under preceding administrations, up until the time of the illness of the President.

Mr. KEARNS. Any man could get in there if he was properly vouched for, but you can not get into the Executive Mansion now unless you have a special privilege. I would like to know if there were special privileges handed out here as to admittance to the White House?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Of course not.

Mr. KEARNS. Then I want to say that the public has been excluded from the White House at least two years and nine months.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have just stated to the gentleman that they were excluded from the White House during the war, and the war began in 1917.

Mr. KEARNS. But the war closed on the 11th day of November, 1918.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has just pointed out that during the time following that, when the President was in France, the public were freely admitted to all portions of the first floor of the White House.

Mr. KEARNS. And the gentleman from Texas, on closer examination, says they were admitted only three months of that time. He was away six months—I think eight months.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There was a part of the time, the gentleman will recall, when they were repairing the White House and were making considerable changes in it with the money that was appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. KEARNS. May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee another question?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have not the floor.

Mr. KEARNS. You were granted it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No. The gentleman from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. WALSH. I will yield for one additional question.

Mr. KEARNS. I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if the gentleman's constituency has had free access to the White House at all times since November 11, 1918, with the exception of three months?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to say to the gentleman that my constituency has had no freer access to the White House than the constituency of the gentleman from Ohio. I can not remember the exact dates when they were excluded from the White House.

Mr. KEARNS. I will say to the gentleman that my constituency, and the constituency of the entire State of Ohio, has been barred from the White House, with the exception of possibly three months, since the 6th day of April, 1917.

Mr. BLANTON. And one of them will be barred for the next four years.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending.

Mr. CONNALLY. I oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. That amendment is not now in order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment. There is no chance in the world to pass it, and so I withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] asks unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For fuel for the Executive Mansion and greenhouses, \$8,000.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise to oppose the amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ANDERSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13870) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 2792. An act to enlarge the boundaries of the Oregon National Forest.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills and joint resolution:

H. R. 6750. An act to deport certain undesirable aliens and to deny readmission to those deported;

H. R. 9615. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to correct an error in an Indian allotment;

H. R. 12400. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Maine into the Union;

H. R. 12537. An act to provide for an examination and report on the condition and possible irrigation development of the Imperial Valley in California;

H. R. 12824. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Alabama into the Union;

H. R. 13139. An act for the sale of isolated tracts in the former Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, N. Dak.;

H. R. 13227. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims;

H. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution to correct an error in the wording of the appropriation of \$71,000 made in the act approved July 9, 1918, and to authorize the Secretary of War to pay said sum to respective parties entitled thereto; and

H. R. 8314. An act to provide for the training of officers of the Army in aeronautic engineering.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 4212. An act to authorize the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey to construct a bridge across the waters of the Delaware River between the city of Easton, in the State of Pennsylvania, and the city of Phillipsburg, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### RETIREMENT OF EMPLOYEES IN THE CLASSIFIED SERVICE.

Mr. LEHLBACH, from the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, presented for printing, under the rule, the conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1699) providing for the retirement of employees in the civil service.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the soldiers' bonus legislation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the soldiers' bonus legislation. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on revenue taxation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Dickinson amendment to the sundry civil bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the sundry civil bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the soldiers' bonus.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the soldiers' bonus. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, May 8, 1920, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting request for legislation to permit the correction of the general account of the Treasurer of the United States (H. Doc. No. 756); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation providing for the relief of the Treasurer of the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a tentative draft of legislation providing for the return of the wives of soldiers to the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GANDY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 2964) providing additional time for the payment of purchase money under homestead entries of lands within the former Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation, in Montana, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 938), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOREMUS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13606) granting the consent of Congress to the city of St. Paul, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 937), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VOLSTEAD, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13931) to authorize the association of producers of agricultural products, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 939), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.



Mr. CRAGO, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13942) to amend section 1342 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, known as the Articles of War, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 940), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13908) to amend section 16 of the act of Congress approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm-loan act, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 941), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13755) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe A. Rawles, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 13976) to amend an act approved February 27, 1919, entitled "An act granting consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River, at or near Sixteenth Street, in the city of Pittsburgh, county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13977) to amend an act approved February 27, 1919, entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River, at or near Millvale Borough, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13978) to amend an act approved February 27, 1919, entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River, at or near McKees Rocks Borough, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 13979) to provide allowances for mothers with children under 16 dependent upon them for support in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 13980) providing for the deportation of aliens upon a second conviction for illegal traffic in narcotics; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 13981) to authorize the issue of United States bonds to be used in the purchase of farm-loan bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CURRY of California: A bill (H. R. 13982) to make a preliminary survey of the Calaveras River in California, with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. MADDEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 353) to create a joint committee on the reorganization of the administrative branch of the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 13983) granting a pension to Eliza Oldham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GANLY: A bill (H. R. 13984) granting an increase of pension to Henry P. Niebuhr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRELD: A bill (H. R. 13985) granting a pension to Joseph A. Branstetter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 13986) for the relief of Theresa M. Shea; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 13987) granting an increase of pension to James D. Silman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13988) granting an increase of pension to Joseph J. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKINIRY: A bill (H. R. 13989) granting a pension to Charles L. Winans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 13990) granting a pension to Christian Hess; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 13991) granting a pension to Hugh E. Murphy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 13992) granting a pension to Mary A. Crate; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 13993) granting a pension to Michael Burns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3487. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of citizens of Stanislaus County, Calif., indorsing House bill 1112, providing for the parole of Federal prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3488. By Mr. DYER: Petition of Missouri State Dental Association and Northwest Missouri Dental Association, protesting against the proposed tariff on dental instruments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3489. Also, petition of Great Lakes Engineering Works and N. R. Leavitt, favoring adoption of the bill increasing the concurrent jurisdiction of the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3490. Also, petition of Hess & Culbertson Jewelry Co., protesting against the proposed tax on advertising; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3491. Also, petition of Jennings & Cushman, protesting against the proposed excise tax on gold used in the arts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3492. Also, petition of Edward Byrnes, protesting against the McNary shoe-branding bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3493. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Rockford (Ill.) Real Estate Board, protesting against the passage of House bill 12397; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3494. Also, petition of the Asko Co., of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the passage of House bill 12976; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3495. By Mr. GLYNN: Petition of sundry citizens of Torrington, Conn., favoring the passage of House bill 1112, for the parole of Federal prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3496. By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of American Newspaper Publishers' Association, advocating certain legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3497. By Mr. MCGLENNON: Petition of Joseph Plunkett Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, of Harrison, N. J., favoring the passage of House resolution 520; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3498. Also, petition of Charles Carroll Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, Carrollton, N. J., favoring the establishment of a consular service with the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3499. Also, petition of patients of the Walter Reed Hospital, opposing a cash bonus and asking for readjustment of insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3500. Also, petition of American Newspaper Publishers' Association, advocating adoption of certain legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3501. By Mr. MICHENER: Petitions of Leland E. Gorton, Ypsilanti; Grace Geiger, secretary Salem Farmers' Club, Salem; A. P. Mitchell, secretary Sand Creek Milk Producers' Association, Sand Creek; Aubrey Pocklington, secretary Britton Dairy Association, Britton; DeForest Thompson, secretary Salem Milk Producers' Association, Salem; C. V. Ballard, county agricultural agent, Jackson; Luther Clark, Milan; George Gill, Ypsilanti; A. L. Wilbur, route No. 3, Ypsilanti; Ralph Dunham, route No. 3, Ypsilanti; Fred W. Wenk, Chelsea; W. S. Rooke, Ypsilanti; R. A. Trowbridge, Ypsilanti; Ennis Twist, Ypsilanti; L. A. Seamans, secretary Washtenaw County Farm Bureau, Belleville; A. C. Stein, Ann Arbor; F. E. Spafard, Manchester; F. E. Rawson, Manchester; Fred R. Rice, Ann Arbor; Lena Rice, Ann Arbor; Fred Nickel, Monroe; George W. Miller, Ypsilanti; George W. McCalla, Ypsilanti; August Lesser, secretary-treasurer Dexter Agricultural Association, Dexter; Homer P. Lehman, Manchester; C. R. Leland, Ann Arbor; John Kraft, Ypsilanti; C. D. Finkbeiner, Clinton; W. A. Freeman, Ypsilanti; W. S. Draper, Ypsilanti; E. M. Eiseman, Chelsea; Mort Crittenden, Ypsilanti; William Clements & Son, Saline; Charles E. Clark & Sons, Chelsea; Edwin Conklin, Ypsilanti; Herman Bauer, Ann Arbor; G. E. Douglas, Ypsilanti; Edith S. Townsend, Harriott Shankland, Delilah Shankland, and Ransom S. Townsend, Ann Arbor; Charles P. Knight, Ann Arbor; E. E. Whitney, Ann Arbor; Herman Haas, Ann Arbor; A. W. MacFarlane, Ypsilanti; L. H. Kirtland, president Monroe County Farm Bureau, Erie; F. D. Jackson, Milan; W. H.

Every, Manchester; Elmer Wisnor, Ann Arbor; W. E. Baker, Clayton; Edward P. Yost, Belleville; William Heller, secretary Pittsfield Union Grange, Ann Arbor; Arthur H. Perrine, secretary E. Tompkins and Rives Farmers' Club, Rives; and Salem Milk Producers' Association, Salem, all in the State of Michigan, favoring Capper-Hersman bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3502. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of William H. C. D'Antignac, chairman of the D'Antignac Protective Political League (Inc.), favoring an increase in salary for trained employees in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3503. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Calif., urging that the jurisdictional limit of the district courts be raised from \$10,000 to \$250,000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3504. Also, petition of Commonwealth Club of California, urging the establishment of a department of public works; to the Committee on the Budget.

3505. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Augustus P. Gardner Post, No. 18, American Legion, Washington, D. C., opposing bonus for soldiers not disabled in the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3506. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of the Women's Federated Club of Garrison, N. Dak., indorsing the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

3507. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of H. E. Hagan, Boston, Mass., protesting against the passage of the McNary bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3508. Also, petition of joint postal organization of Boston, Mass., favoring immediate action on increased pay for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3509. Also, petition of Charles E. Cheever, Joseph F. Gusick, Edw. F. Dalton, and Walter L. Murphy, of Boston, Mass., urging the inclusion of field clerks in the Army pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE.

SATURDAY, May 8, 1920.

(Legislative day of Friday, May 7, 1920.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1699) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 13665. An act granting the consent of Congress to Muskogee County, Okla., to construct a bridge across the Arkansas River, between sections 16 and 21, township 15 north, range 19 east, in the State of Oklahoma; and

H. R. 13666. An act granting the consent of Congress to Muskogee County, Okla., to construct a bridge across the Arkansas River, in section 18, township 12 north, range 21 east, in the State of Oklahoma.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 2792. An act to enlarge the boundaries of the Oregon National Forest;

H. R. 13590. An act granting the consent of Congress to Sid Smith, of Bonham, Tex., for the construction of a bridge across the Red River between the counties of Fannin, Tex., and Bryan, Okla.; and

H. R. 13724. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Sabine River at or near Orange, Tex.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of the Ministerial Union of the Central Young Men's Christian Association, of Topeka, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to create in the Army a chaplain corps, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, of Leavenworth, Kans.,

remonstrating against the passage of the so-called sedition bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented a petition of sundry citizens of Frederick, Md., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 4352) authorizing the Indians residing on or belonging to the Turtle Mountain Reservation, N. Dak., to submit claims to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 4353) to authorize the President to appoint Henry S. Kiersted a major in the Medical Corps of the Army of the United States on the retired list (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 4354) for the relief of Roach, Stansell, Lowrance Bros. & Co., of Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on Claims.

### INSCRIPTIONS ON ARLINGTON AMPHITHEATER.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask unanimous consent to introduce a short joint resolution. I will state that it is a copy of the joint resolution introduced in the House of Representatives by that brave old leader, Gen. SHERWOOD, of Ohio, one of the few veterans of the Civil War left in the House. I should like to have it passed to-day, if possible. I do not think any Senator will object to it. I ask that it be read for information.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 194) to include the names of southern military leaders in the inscriptions on the amphitheater at Arlington was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States made provision for the erection of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater; and  
Whereas the commission provided for by Congress for the construction of the memorial includes a representative of the United Confederate Veterans; and  
Whereas the commission is unable to construe the law to include the names of Confederate leaders to be inscribed on the memorial; and  
Whereas, by act of Congress, a Confederate section has been set apart at Arlington for Confederate dead; and  
Whereas the Confederate Veterans and their sons and grandsons, in peace and in active military service during the War with Spain, and on every field in Europe in the World War, demonstrated their fealty to the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the commission created by act of Congress having in charge the construction of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater be hereby authorized, at their discretion, to make provision to include the names of southern military leaders in the inscriptions on the amphitheater.

Mr. SMOOT. I understand that this is a joint resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator from North Carolina whether it has passed the House?

Mr. OVERMAN. No; it has not. It is pending in the House. It was introduced in the House by Gen. SHERWOOD, of Ohio.

Mr. SMOOT. As it is a joint resolution, it seems to me it ought to go to the committee and be reported back to the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. Technically that would be the orderly way, but I do not see any use of that procedure. The joint resolution is only six lines in length and gives the commission discretion which protects the provision.

Mr. SMOOT. I am aware of that.

Mr. OVERMAN. It authorizes them and gives them the discretion. I want to say that they have submitted to some of the great educators of the country the names that should be inscribed on the amphitheater, and one of the commission called attention to the fact that the great generals of the South, such as Lee and Jackson, were Americans, and all Americans were proud of them. Union soldiers wanted these names put on; and it is the right thing also to select a few names from the Confederates, together with names of Revolutionary heroes, Spanish-American War heroes, and others. The commission want to do it, but they have not the discretion to do it. The joint resolution only allows them the discretion if in their opinion it should be done. That is all the joint resolution provides.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not a question of what the joint resolution provides, Mr. President. I am simply saying that it is a joint resolution, not a simple Senate resolution, and that it ought to go to a committee; and the committee should report it out.